

# AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

---

VOL. XXIX.—JANUARY, 1877.

---

## PIONEER OR MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

In discussing important principles of Church polity as well as questions of exegesis or theology, it is necessary first of all to "define terms." Otherwise the subject considered may be involved in confusion, and serious misconceptions and misunderstandings may arise. What is meant by a Pioneer Bishop? We understand him to be a Bishop sent to an outlying part of the great field, not necessarily in advance of Christians of the laity, or of Priests and Deacons, but antecedently to the formation of a Diocesan Convention of six, or any number of Presbyters and delegates of Parishes. The work of such Bishop is to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; to win souls to Christ; to organize believers for efficient work; to lay solid foundations of Missions and other Church institutions, and thus prepare the way for the Diocesan organization of his entire field, or of its convenient subdivisions. Probably few have ever imagined a pioneer Bishop

in any of our Domestic Missions to be one who goes alone into his distant territory to find no Christian people, and to labor without help or co-operation. The population of all our territories is for the most part, at least nominally, Christian. Even in foreign fields, where Bishops are sent to plant missions, the points first chosen are those to which commerce has led the way, and Christians may be in advance to welcome and help them. The pioneer Bishop is simply the Bishop of a missionary jurisdiction, which is a Diocese or Dioceses in process of formation. Having received his commission, he enlists his men and leads them into the forefront, precisely as in modern warfare. The initial movement in forming an army does not come from those of whom the army is to be composed. The order is first from the Government. The chief officers are placed in command. They choose their captains. Recruits are then received. And the army goes forth organized and under leaders. The successful general is one who knows, personally, every part of the enemy's country; who plans his campaign intelligently, and who is on the ground and directs his forces in every engagement.

We may have "devised new ways," not distinctly sanctioned by Apostolic, or early Catholic practice, in "carrying out the Master's will." But we have not done so in the matter of pioneer Bishops. We are not willing to concede that our missionary policy of sending Bishops to initiate organized Church work, to ordain Elders, and set in order the things that are wanting, is a modern "device." We do not doubt that it is a true principle that the Church may rightfully adopt new plans and methods of work according to the exigencies of times and circumstances. But if there is any thing in which we stand on Apostolic and Catholic ground, it is in giving Bishops the leadership in missionary work. This practice, revived in the American Church in 1835, has the sanction of the Church from the beginning, with the doubtful exception of some Monkish or Monastic missions; and, as might be expected, results such as are generally looked for only in the missions of the early ages of Christianity, have rewarded our faith and our loyalty to true missionary principle. These are the two points which we propose to prove.

That Bishops should be pioneer missionaries is in our view in-

volved in the Apostolic Commission, which is the charter of the Church, and determines its missionary policy: "Go ye into all the world." "Make disciples of all nations." To the eleven and their successors was given by our Lord both mission and jurisdiction universally. If the college of the Apostles, after filling the place of Judas, "tarried in Jerusalem," as they probably did for some twelve or fourteen years, it was as taught of the Holy Ghost, to understand the command of our Lord,—for the purpose of fully organizing this Mother Church, with its Apostle-Bishop, its Presbyters, and Deacons and Ministers of the laity. This preliminary work was so important as to require the united wisdom of the whole Apostolic body. Hence, not even the confirming and organizing the converts made by Philip in Samaria, though requiring the presence of such leaders as Peter and John, could withdraw them more than temporarily from it. It was necessary first of all to create a centre for their work and a base for their aggressive efforts. It is suggestive, however, that the chief of the Apostles was a pioneer in opening the door of faith to the Gentiles, having been supernaturally directed to instruct and baptise Cornelius, and not merely to confirm him. To say that St. Peter, as he "passed through all quarters," was only acting at the bidding of "the saints" who had "called for him," is to say what is true only in the exceptional case of Dorcas, and is nothing to the purpose. He was acting as a Chief Missionary, and it does not appear that he intrusted any part of his work to ministers of inferior orders until he had visited and examined, personally, the fields of his jurisdiction. There is every reason, both from Scripture and tradition, to believe that this Apostle did do pioneer work for the Gospel, for we find that those parts of the field of which he assumed the care, whether at Antioch, Rome or Babylon, or in the countries of Asia mentioned in his first epistle, were not left by him so that churches could be organized even temporarily by laymen on the Congregational, or by Presbyters on the Presbyterian theory. His pioneer work was so effectual that in no instance was the model of the Church of Jerusalem departed from. Wherever he was the first Bishop, he took care that Bishops should succeed him; and hence, in authentic tradition and history, he has eminently the character of a Founder.

It has not often been denied that the great Apostle to the Gentiles was in fact, however it be accounted for, a "pioneer," and that he did in many places break new ground for the Church. His custom was, wherever it was practicable, to proclaim the word of faith first to the *Jews*, who, as a general thing, were so far from "sending for him" that they rejected both him and his message. Rejected of the Jews, he turned to the Gentiles and found them, or at least some of them, willing to hear, according to the Prophecy. In many places, Christians were in advance of him, but they were not in advance as Congregational or Presbyterian societies. They were not organized and consolidated into churches. It would appear that even in ministering to the saints, St. Paul was doing the pioneer work of the ministry. The early Church strangely misconceived his character and his position in relation to the origin of the Church in the many cities which he visited, and to which, as we know, from St. Luke's narrative and from his epistles, he gave much time and care, if he was not, as was supposed, the foremost missionary of the Apostolic Church.

The claim that pioneer Bishops are a "modern device" leads to such incredible assumptions as that they, to whom the Lord said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," went nowhere till the demand had been created for them, and that the demand was created by laymen before the Apostles ordained Elders in every city. It leaves us to infer that there were no other ministers but Apostles, Deacons like Philip, and "the saints;" that in some way not explained, the Apostles were almost everywhere preceded by the Church, and that they only came forth from their dignified retirement "to supply the demand," and as seems to be implied also, by way of ornament. A novel theory, surely, among Churchmen! Its statement is its sufficient refutation.

But lest it should be seen that St. Paul's example as an Apostle establishes the principle of Apostolic pioneers, it is contended that his ministry was altogether exceptional and peculiar. Of course it was. All beginnings are peculiar, but they involve the germs and determine the character of the whole subsequent growth. Is it even conceivable that the example of one who so impressed himself upon the mind and life of the Church should not be followed? Is it possible that those Apostolic compan-



ions of his, to whom he assigned, one after another, Sees or Missionary Districts of his vast jurisdiction, should have adopted an idea of the Episcopal office different from and opposed to his? Could Timothy and Titus, Silas, Epaphroditus and others, when assigned to their spheres of labor, so have understood their positions and functions, as to have assumed to be reserved and dignified officials, whose business it was to remain in the back ground for others to do the work of evangelization, and to go forth as sent for, not as sent, careful to observe the law of supply and demand as to Apostolic labor? To believe this, Churchmen will require stronger reasons than any that have been presented.

At the close of the first century there were Apostolic Sees at Jerusalem, Antioch, Philippi, Corinth, Rome, in the chief cities of Asia Minor, and other places, all established by Apostles. Most of them were, in fact,—all were in theory, Missionary Episcopates. And from these, in less than three centuries, there were developed, according to the estimate of Gibbon, one thousand Sees in the West, and eight hundred in the East. By what process and under what theory of Church extension was this done? Not certainly by leaving the work of preaching the Gospel to the saints scattered abroad, nor even to Presbyters. The notices we find in early writers are distinct enough to show that the successors of the Apostles, following Apostolic precedent, were Chief Missionaries, and that it was their special work to extend the Church, to subdivide the vast field, and to multiply Dioceses as the growth of the Church made it necessary.

We rejoice in the fact, now placed beyond all question, that in Apostolic times, and subsequently, "the brethren" were preachers in a true sense in their private spheres of secular duty. We earnestly believe in the "vocation and ministry" of Christians, both men and women. It accords entirely with our view of the spread of Christianity, that laymen, converted on the day of Pentecost, went home to the various countries they inhabited to make known the faith of Christ, and that subsequently, as by persecution, the Christians of Jerusalem were scattered abroad, they "went everywhere preaching the Word," by telling "what the Lord had done for their souls." This activity of the lay people in the Apostolic age gave rise, no doubt, to the organization

of the lay orders of the inferior clergy which, in subsequent times, were so marked a feature of the Church. But laymen did not transcend their place and sphere. Apostles and Apostolic men were, without question, the pioneers, organizers and founders. The consentient testimony of Scripture and early ecclesiastical history puts this beyond controversy.

The traditions are well known which assign to the Apostles the preaching of the Gospel and the founding of the Church in various countries. As to the value of these traditions, it is safe to trust to the judgment of learned historians, who have carefully scrutinized all the evidence upon the subject. We cannot greatly err if we agree with them that these traditions have large elements of truth. There is probably no very serious doubt that the Apostles, after their separation, did personally carry the Gospel and the organic Church into various regions as remote as Spain and India, Parthia and Arabia. It is the fact at any rate that almost every nation claimed as the founder of its Church an Apostle or an Apostolic man of eminence. What does this prove? If we should grant that the claim was in some cases false, it could not have been inconsistent with the theory of Church extension in the times when it originated. The traditions of the Apostles and their companions, planting the Church in almost every part of the world, belong to the second, third and fourth centuries. Even though they were unreliable, they are witnesses to the fact that in these times the pioneer work of founding churches was thought to be the right thing for Apostles to do. The traditions could not have arisen if in these times the practice had been for the Bishops to remain at their Sees till sent for, till the demand for them had been in some chance-way created. If they were habitually doing Apostolic and pioneer work, the traditions of the activity of the Apostles and Evangelists of the first age are consistent and credible. Had they been opposed to current custom they could have gained no credence, and no record of them would have remained.

The notices we have in early writers of the conversion of nations on the outskirts or outside of the Roman Empire, accord fully with this view of the Episcopate. The mission of Pantænus is not opposed to it. His office is not stated. He is noted

rather as a philosopher, head of the Alexandrian school, and teacher of St. Clement, than as a missionary. If he went as such to India,—Mosheim thinks it was to Jewish Christians of Arabia Felix—it was as sent by Demetrius, his Bishop, and the result was, that he soon learned that he was not a pioneer. St. Bartholomew had preached to these people. They were Christians still, and the Gospel of St. Matthew, in Hebrew, was preserved among them. (Euseb. B. v. : c. 10.)

In the third century, "two instances of successful missionary work among new nations," by men of no higher rank than Presbyters, have been cited by a recent writer. The first is that of "Origen preaching for a time among some Arab tribes." This is an error. This great catechetical teacher acquired a reputation, which led to his being employed on various missions for imparting knowledge of the Scriptures, or for the confutation of heresy. He probably went three times to Arabia. First by the appointment of his Bishop and the prefect of Egypt, for the satisfaction of an Arab chief or governor who had sent for him, "that he might impart to him his doctrine." (Euseb. vi. : 19.) Having dispatched his business he ere long returned to Alexandria. So afterwards, when he went thither to confute Berythus, Bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, and subsequently a sect of heretics called "the Arabians." (Euseb. vi. : 33, 37.)

The other instance is that of large numbers of the Goths converted by Priests, whom they had taken captives. Of course these Priests, involuntarily in servitude, if true to their vows, would have fulfilled their office of preaching as they had opportunity. Sozomen, however, to whom we are indebted for the account, attributes the conversions they made to their godly example and their miracles. (Soz. ii. : 6.) The historian Socrates gives the remarkable instance of the conversion of the Iberians by a captive woman. (Soc. i. : 20.) Other like illustrations might be cited of "woman's work" in promoting the spread of Christianity. It is pleasant to think of captives, prisoners of war, men or women, clergy or laity, converting their barbarian captors. There was still room, however, for the Bishops to come in as the pioneers in establishing the Church, supplying clergy and determining the policy of further Church extension, and it will be

found that they generally did so. Otherwise we should have had accounts of some Pitcairn Island arrangement, of churches self-originated and autocephalous in other than the ecclesiastical sense.

In the fourth century occurred the remarkable example of Frumentius and Ædesius, captive youths preaching the Gospel and establishing Christian worship in Abyssinia, or "Middle India." (Soc. i.: 19.) It is strange that any one should have found in this faithfulness of laymen to Christian obligation an argument against Bishops as pioneers. Athanasius, and his brother Bishops of Alexandria, who consecrated and sent Frumentius to be the Missionary Bishop of that heathen country, took a different view. The only Christians there were those whom they had converted. No minister of any order was on the ground. If our House of Bishops should send a Missionary Bishop to a territory with no clergy in it, with but one congregation of Christians, and they possibly unbaptised, and certainly unconfirmed and non-communicants, the remaining population knowing nothing of Christianity, we are sure they would not be justified on the principle of Bishops going only when called for by sufficient numbers of those desiring their special ministrations. It would be a venture in pioneer Episcopal work far in advance of any thing we have yet attempted.

To this same century belongs the long Missionary Episcopate of Ulphilus, the Apostle of the Goths. He was consecrated at Constantinople by Eusebius, of Nicomedia: (Maclear's *Missions in Middle Ages*, p. 39), and his entire work of translating the Scriptures, converting the people and initiating them in the arts of industrial and civilized life, was done while acting legitimately as a Missionary Bishop. We are willing to leave out of sight his Arianism in view of his Apostolic zeal and labors.

The fifth century is distinguished for its missions in the West. Neander says: "In ancient Gaul the Christian love of many pious Bishops was manifested by their indefatigable and arduous labors during a period of great political commotion." He proceeds to give at length the history of Germanus, of Auxerre, consecrated A. D. 418, (Peregrinus, a Bishop of whom little is known, was the founder of this Church), and of Lupus, of Loyes, his contemporary and friend, both sent—the former more than once—to

counteract the spread of Pelagianism in Britain, but returning to prosecute their missionary work among the Franks. So also, a little later, Cæsarius, of Arles, Eligius, of Noyon, and others, were distinguished missionaries.

Thus we have given a few of the instances of Apostolic missionary labors during the three or four centuries after the Apostles. It is not necessary to attempt to be exhaustive. The remark of Gibbon is verified, that from the Apostles' times there was no Church without its Bishop; or, as Lingard says in his *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, (p. 40): "Wherever Christianity penetrated it was accompanied with the Episcopal order, and the anomalous existence of a church without a Bishop was a phenomenon reserved for the admiration of later ages."

Church extension was largely promoted in the early Middle Ages by missionaries of the Monastic orders. In the East the theory of the Cœnobite life was seclusion for the cultivation of a higher sanctity. The Eastern Eremites were not missionaries. In the West, Monasticism though derived from the East, became intensely active in missionary work.

Christianity had made much progress in Britain during the second and third centuries, as usual doubtless, by the leading instrumentality of Bishops. At the close of this period, Gieseler informs us, "the first traces of Bishops appear on the Rhine." Palladius, A. D. 431, was sent by Celestine as Bishop to spread Christianity among the barbarians in Ireland. His mission failing of success, St. Patrick, ordained Bishop in Gaul, A. D. 432—Maclear assures us of this "on good authority," (*Hist. of Missions*, etc.)—undertook this mission. His work made so much progress that in A. D. 439, three new Bishops, Secundarius, Auxilius, and Severinus were appointed for parts of the jurisdiction, enabling the chief Apostle to undertake missionary journeys in Ulster, Leinster, and Cashel. Here as everywhere the Apostolic practice was followed. (Maclear, p. 69, 70.)

But the custom of sending the Bishop as the pioneer was departed from for the first time in the sending of Augustine, the Monk, with his forty companions, to convert the Anglo-Saxons. The writer who remarks that "it is not known that there is any earlier instance of the sending out of a Bishop to plant the Church



in what was supposed to be new ground, than the mission of Augustine to England at the close of the sixth century," could not have considered well the facts in the case. Augustine was not sent as Bishop, and a Priest or Priests were before him in Bertha's household. He had the good sense, however, to discover before long, that his mission required Episcopal leadership and oversight, and in the course of a year he sought consecration of Virgilius, Bishop of Arles. His mission was successful in the kingdom of Kent. Outside of this it made but little progress during his lifetime, and it came near being overwhelmed by Paganism. The conversion of the other kingdoms of the Heptarchy was accomplished by Missionary Bishops, largely from the Monastery of Iona, "the chief seminary of religion in the north of Britain," and from that of Lindisfarne, the "Holy Island," both, in fact, "associate missions." The necessities of their position made the leading Bishops who were engaged in this work, even under Roman influence, in the full sense pioneers. Such were Mellitus, who converted Essex, the zealous Paulinus consecrated for Northumbria, and Elutherius "for the whole of the Bishopric of the west Saxons," Felix, a Burgundian Prelate, who won to the Church the east Angles, Birinus, Bishop to "the idolatrous tribes" of Wessex, and Wilfred, who for five years performed the work of a Missionary Bishop among the people of Sussex, and reclaimed them from their heathenism." (Maclear, p. 130—Bede, B, ii., iii.) But the great pioneer Missionary Bishops of this period were not trained under Roman influence nor directed by Roman policy. They were the followers of St. Columba, who, though a Bishop-designate, through what he considered a providential circumstance, did not rise to the Episcopal order. We may best sum up the work and the success of these great missionaries in the words of an old Chronicle: "Per hos sanctissimos viros Episcopos Aidanum, Finanum, Colmanum, sive per se sive per alios quos ipsi consecratos Anglis dederant Episcopos et sacerdotes, regna quatuor, duo Northunbriorum, Merciorum, Midilanglorum, et media pars regni Saxonum Orientalium usque Thamesis pæne ripam ad Christi conversa sunt." (Fordun. Scoti-Chron.) This glorious succession of Missionary Bishops is continued in Diuma a Scot, Cedd, Chad, Cuthbert, and other Britons. (See

Bede, B. iii., iv.; Maclear, vi.) To show the character of these Bishops: Of Aiden it is said that "he was wont to traverse both town and country, never on horseback unless compelled by some urgent necessity, and whenever in his way he saw rich or poor he urged them to embrace the faith, and, if believers, he was wont to stir them up by words and actions to alms and good works." (Bede, iii.: 5.) Bede says of St. Chad, Bishop of Litchfield, A. D. 665, that after his consecration he "went about after the manner of the Apostles, on foot, to preach the Gospel in towns, in the open country, in cottages, villages, and castles,"—pioneer work such as his latest successor in that See could scarcely have rivalled when he was Missionary Bishop of New Zealand.

The leading missionaries in Germany were Abbots of monasteries and not always invested with the Episcopal office. The Roman Church still follows this policy in opposition to Catholic usage. It was useful in the Middle ages, but we are hardly prepared to advocate it for ourselves. Though some famous and successful missionaries like St. Columba, probably never rose to a higher rank than Presbyter, yet it was found that Monastic missions required Bishops as leaders. Two or three instances will suffice. Amandus was ordained A. D. 630, "*Episcopus regionarius*" for the neighborhood of Ghent and Antwerp. St. Elroy, A. D. 641, as Bishop of Tournay and Noyon, Bonifacius (St. Winfred), A. D. 723, Apostle of Germany, Missionary Bishop of Thuringia. Out of his immense jurisdiction were soon formed the Dioceses of Saltzburg, Ratisbon, Friesingen and Passau. Thus even Monasticism in planting missions in new countries, though sometimes departing from it, was mindful of Apostolic and primitive practice.

Our case might be made much stronger by reference to the Nestorian and other missions of the East, and the missions to the Norwegians, the Selaves, etc. in Europe. This is certain, and important to be remembered. The churches of the West, in England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, etc., were planted by Missionary Bishops. So in Scandinavia, Russia, Hungary, and in what is now, we trust, not long to be—"Turkey in Europe."

The Christianity which is influential to-day, its aggressive missionary character is the growth from the seeds sown at the first by pioneer Bishops.

It remains to show—and it can be done in brief—some of the results in the case of missions of the American Church, after we had returned to the practice shown to have been universal in the best ages of the Church. It is not to be denied that each of those known among us as Missionary Bishops is a pioneer. Bishop Clarkson was none the less at the head of his mission though he found clergy and laity enough to organize a Diocese in Nebraska. Bishop Tuttle was such though there were many Christians before him in Montana and Idaho, and some even in Utah. Bishop Whitaker is not to be defrauded of the glory of leadership though he labored some time as Presbyter, and returned like the layman Frumentius—to be consecrated Bishop of Nevada. New Mexico and Arizona is perhaps the most unpromising just at this time of our missionary districts. Only one Presbyter is there. Yet there are hundreds, perhaps thousands of Christians in those territories. Still pioneership must characterise the Bishop, nor will he be out of place as being a "Bishop in the wilderness," a "Shepherd without a flock." Even should a Bishop be sent to Alaska, he would find and raise up Christian workers on the soil, besides those he would take with him into the field. And if the Church had sufficient zeal and earnestness in mission work to prosecute it with efficiency, the wisdom of the course would be justified.

Jackson Kemper was the first great Missionary Bishop of the American Church. In 1865, Bishop Talbot, who had been for five years Missionary Bishop of the Northwest, successor in part to Bishop Kemper, resigned his jurisdiction, and out of it were formed, in the course of four years, the Missionary Dioceses which are now in charge of Bishops Clarkson, Spalding, Tuttle and Whitaker. Bishop Scott went to Oregon in 1854. He dying in 1867, Bishop Morris succeeded him the following year. Previous to this time, but little in these jurisdictions was done beyond ascertaining by personal observation the nature, condition and wants of the various portions of the vast field. Without detracting any thing from the high merits of the earlier pioneers, whose work in its very nature, and in the circumstances of the time, must have availed most in the great subsequent increase for which they prepared the way, and in the intensifying of missionary life and promoting a truer conception of the principles involved in the

mission work among Churchmen in the older Dioceses, we may safely assign the sum total of results for the five jurisdictions, an average period for all of them of a single decade. Now what are these results? And are they such as to justify the sending of Bishops to the front as pioneers?

Statistics are too little valued. There are none to be found from which the gains from year to year can be ascertained. But what the Church has secured and holds in these jurisdictions can easily be discovered. Take first Colorado and Wyoming, from 1866. Ten years have given eighteen churches and chapels now in use, four rectories, including an Episcopal residence, two boarding schools, with large permanent buildings, which are educating many of the boys and girls who will go forth to strengthen the Church in all parts of the field. Six hundred and fifty-six have been confirmed. The number of communicants is over eight hundred. Seventeen clergy are at work. The value of Church property acquired is nearly \$200,000. What is true of this district is in large measure true of the others. We have in the jurisdictions of the five Bishops referred to, about ninety Church buildings and eighty clergymen, and not much less than four thousand communicants. In the several boarding schools we are educating, annually, nearly one hundred boys and three or four hundred girls, and thus exerting an influence as marked as it is commanding. The value of Church property for all purposes is probably nearly one million dollars. But what can be stated approximately in figures is but a small part of what has been accomplished. The souls saved, helped spiritually, educated for Heaven, cannot be numbered. Nor is it possible to estimate the power given to the growing Church in these distant regions by placing tried men at the head of her missionary operations, and the weight of influence for good which is thereby secured. The office of a Bishop is in itself a power, even to those who know nothing of Episcopacy. It gives to the Church in these new fields an authority, a prestige, and a high vantage ground in mission work, which are by no means unimportant elements of success.

We venture to say that without Bishops as pioneers, the same growth would have required fifty years. On the old method of waiting in each territory till there were Presbyters and laymen

enough to organize a Diocese and elect a Bishop, and strength enough to support him, it would not have been attained in a much longer period, if ever, for our lost opportunities would have been embraced by others, and we could never have regained them.

Ten years is but a short space in the Christian ages. We ought not to expect to see great results in any limited period, nor even in our life-time. The Church lives on. Its work never ceases. Its results are to be seen but partially in time; fully, only in eternity. But we are quite certain that the results, as given of the last decade of missionary labor, after all abatements for inaccuracy of estimate, if any are necessary, cannot be paralleled in any of the older parts of our country. To find any thing surpassing them we must go back to the early missionary ages. The growth of which we are thus compelled to speak is enough to give faith and courage to the Church, and to inspire larger zeal, devotion, self-denial and "laying by in store" for the cause. And we say unhesitatingly that it is chiefly due to the return, (after long working on the other method, derived remotely from Romanism, of depressing the office and work of Bishops,) to the Apostolic and primitive plan of sending Bishops, with the great trust and responsibility of leadership, as pioneers into every field where it is desired to plant the Church of God.

Another great advantage of the sending out of such Bishops is, that it is teaching the Church at home a lesson which it is rapidly learning, and which is of estimable value. Diocesan Bishops are seldom regarded now as the Bishops only of the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in their respective districts. They are Bishops of all people who have souls to save. Though their business is not proselyting, in any offensive sense, their mission is to all who will receive their ministry, and especially to the indifferent and uncared for, and this determines the mission of their clergy. Hence, even in old Dioceses they are often as truly pioneers as are Bishops in missionary jurisdictions.

And perhaps the most important gain from pioneer Bishops of missionary jurisdictions will be this: We shall be free from the trammels of our poor modern "devices" by which the Church has been so long hindered in its growth. We shall get rid of the



obstructive congregationalism which afflicts so many parishes. We shall be free from the exclusiveness of pew ownership, and God's house, like all God's gifts, will be free. The true primitive Bishops' Church in the chief city, as the centre and base of missionary work, will be regained. The true cathedral system for our American Church can best be worked out in the districts where Dioceses are unorganized and parishes are only missions under the general charge of the Bishop. It will be Diocesan in its character, its chapter of clergy and laity with the Bishop at their head, a large representative body, holding the title as trustees to the Church property, caring for the interests of the various Church institutions by appropriate committees, and managing them without rivalries. Thus it may be made a fact in civil law as well as in ecclesiastical recognition. The cathedral may grow into a reality and a source of strength to missions in the city and throughout the Diocese and not be a mere name for a parish church, with a modified Episcopal rectorship, and frequent and elaborate services; and parochial, mission, educational, charitable and other work may be unified and made harmonious and efficient. We trust that this is no mere aspiration, no idle dream. We are coming up in this Church of ours to the better realization of our Catholic heritage. Missionary Bishops may be, in the Providence of God, from the circumstances in which they are placed, pioneers, not only in setting forward the work of the Church in new fields, but also in thinking out and working out, practically, such plans of organization and such a policy as in early times Bishops in like conditions were led to adopt, to the great advantage of the Church at large.

JOHN FRANKLIN SPALDING.

## CATHEDRALS AND PARISHES.

### A CONTRIBUTION TO THEIR HISTORY.

#### I.

It is settled that we are to have Cathedrals. Much has been written of late upon the need of them, and efforts are making in several directions towards their realization. But it is to be feared that the little which has been done has been rather of the nature of blind experiment than directed by an intelligent appreciation of the problem and the conditions of its solution. There is need of a closer study of the question in its historical and legal development, before we are fitted to enter upon the work of Cathedral organization. The fundamental principles of the institution need to be detached from adventitious circumstances, and from the manifest abuses with which they are mixed up in corporations of a venerable antiquity; and careful analysis and historical deduction are necessary to find the angles of deflection from a true development which occur in the progress from the primitive to the modern establishment.

It is a notion as fallacious as it is arrogant, that we can assume a name which has a history and an idea, and without regard to that history proceed to re-invent an institution which is to embody the idea and bear the name. We cannot in this fashion break with the past. Neither can we, without regard to adaptability, copy the organization which exists somewhere else, and expect it to flourish under the peculiar circumstances, or meet the peculiar wants of the time and people into which it is transplanted. But so to amend the traditional Constitution and By-Laws as not to depart from fundamental and essential principles, to avoid mistakes, to guard against abuses, and to adapt the machinery to the

work it is expected to perform, requires a knowledge, not merely of the present state of the institution elsewhere, but of the institution in its origin; and of the whole history between that origin and its present condition; so as to see not only what it has been, and what it is, but what it is capable of being made.

The work, in fact, which our Cathedral-makers have to perform, is largely negative in its character. In dealing with a name and an idea which have a history, they must say what precedents shall *not* be followed and what notions shall *not* prevail in the American Cathedral, as well as what precedents shall be followed and what notions shall prevail. For when we adopt the word, we accept it with its definition and its previous history; and when the definition is extended by a long history into numberless particulars, and is fixed by legal use to include those particulars, that definition becomes the charter and constitution of the institution itself, governing it far more fully than the written code, which is adopted by vote, and placed on file in the proper office of registration. "The statutes of a Cathedral," says Chancellor Benson, (he is speaking particularly of Lincoln), "were in no respect *privilegia*; they were but a fragment of a powerful and well understood system of law—*jus commune*—which existed throughout Europe; which statutes framed for particular Cathedrals could not contravene and could modify only in some particulars."<sup>1</sup> Now if we adopt the word Cathedral, we bring the thing we so name under the *jus commune*—that common law—and our only way of avoiding such of its prescriptions as would be unadapted to our condition is by the *lex scripta*, which according to the axiom of the lawyers, takes precedence of the common law when it furnishes a rule applicable to a case in hand.

No one, we suppose, wishes to reproduce among us the type of Cathedral organization obtaining at the present time in the Church of England. Despite the regard felt for noble buildings which embody the religious idea in grand architectural forms, there is a wide-spread feeling that they are rather of antiquarian interest than of present use; and the anxiety just now, beyond the water,

<sup>1</sup> Benson, Relation of the Chapter to the Bishop. in Dean Howson's volume p. 239.

is to prevent their being swept away altogether, by trying to find some use for them, and some benefit to the Church at large from the services of the dignified gentlemen who obtain fat livings from their endowments. But if this is not the Cathedral we want, what do we want? Do we want the modern Romish Cathedral? Do we want the pre-reformation Mediæval Cathedral? Or was there a primitive structure and organization on which we can fall back, and from which we can take a new departure? Would it not be better on the whole, discarding the development shaped by the Imperialist and Papalist Churches of Mediæval Europe, to work out an organization for ourselves on the basis of that primitive Church, whose example has never yet failed us, when we have appealed to it for guidance in doctrine, discipline, worship or work!

## II.

The terms Cathedral Church<sup>1</sup> and Cathedral Chapter are not found in the earliest records of our religion. They belong neither to the Scriptural nor to the ante-Nicene period. They are a growth of the times when Christianity had secured a legal recognition, but they have their roots in the primitive polity; and the history of Cathedrals is not traced back far enough until we have considered those institutions of the primitive Church out of which the Cathedral was ultimately evolved.

Whether in the primitive period the Bishop of any city which contained, as all the large cities did, several places of assembly for Christian worship, considered any one of these places of assembly peculiarly his own, rather than any other, is at least questionable. Some authors, as *e. g.*, Thomassen, have inferred, from the fact that the Christians of a city are always called "the Church" and never "the Churches" of that city, that in the earliest age there was but one congregation and place of assembly in each city, and none at all in the adjacent country; and therefore that

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesia Cathedralis* is used in Conc. Tarracona, A. D. 516, Can. 13. Labbe. *Capitulum* or "Chapter," as applied to the Cathedral clergy, was much later, and adopted from the monasteries.

there was in each Diocese only (what was in fact though not in name) the Cathedral Church, Cathedral Congregation and Cathedral Chapter, with the Bishop at their head. But this notion is inconsistent with the conditions of the existence of the Church in large cities—and especially in the ages of persecution. The reason of this mode of speaking is better given by Bishop Pearson :

“It appeareth that a collection of several congregations, every one of which is in some sense a Church and may be called so, is properly one Church by virtue of the subordination of them all in one government under one ruler. For thus in those great and populous cities where christians were very numerous, not only those of several Churches within the cities, but all those also in the adjacent parts were united under the care and inspection of one Bishop, and therefore was accounted one Church; the number of the Churches following the number of the angels, that is the rulers of them, as is evident in the Revelation.<sup>1</sup>

But this being so, and this being the relation of the Bishop to the whole of his flock, it is, as we said, at least questionable whether in the earliest period, under the conditions of the Church's existence at that time there was among the several congregations of such a city as Antioch or Ephesus or Rome, any one Church or place of assembly which was considered peculiarly the Bishop's Church, and in which he would always be found on occasions of public worship. While Christianity was a *religio illicita* there could be no opportunity of the Church's acquiring a title to real estate, and the congregations would of necessity be under obligation to individuals for the use of rooms in private houses as places of assembly. These rooms would be secured in localities convenient to the inhabitants of different districts, and in such numbers that congregations would not be large enough to attract attention in assembling and dispersing. That this was the case at Rome in the second century, appears from a passage in the Acts of martyrdom of Justin Martyr, which are generally accepted as genuine :

Rusticus the prefect said, where do you assemble ? Justin said, where each one chooses and can ; for do you fancy that we all meet in the very same place ? Not so ; because the God of the Christians is not circumscribed by place ; but being invisible fills heaven and earth, and everywhere is worshipped and glorified by the faithful.

<sup>1</sup> Pearson on the Creed, p. 506. Am. Ed.



Rusticus the prefect said: Tell me where do you assemble, or into what place do you collect your followers? Justin said, I live above one Martinus at the Timiotinian Bath; and during the whole time (and I am now living in Rome for the second time) I am unaware of any other meeting than his. And if any one wished to come to me, I communicated to him the doctrines of truth. Rusticus said, Are you not then a Christian? Justin said, yea, I am a Christian.<sup>1</sup>

Here, it will be noticed, Justin expressly tells us that the meetings of the Christians were controlled by circumstances, and that there was no place of general assembly in Rome. And another fact comes out incidentally:—that the Christians, as we might suppose in times of persecution, were careful not to compromise one another by being too inquisitive as to the number or place of their assemblies; but confined themselves, for prudential reasons, each to what was virtually his own parish church. At least this is a fair inference from Justin's declaration that though he was now in Rome for the second time, he knew of no other meeting of Christians than that in the house in which he himself lodged. But this being so, it was impossible that there should be any particular church or house which could be considered, even by analogy, the Cathedral Church of the city.

There is more of fancy than reality in the picture of the primitive assembly which is drawn by means of too hasty inferences from the Apology of Justin Martyr and the Epistles of Ignatius. While the nocturnal or ante-lucan meetings were held in private houses, and that only by the will of their proprietors, we should most frequently have missed the Bishop on his throne, and the "crown of presbyters," and the great congregation, and have been introduced instead to a small company, ministered to by a single presbyter, or two at most; the service seeming more like family worship than the public prayer of our own day. The *corona presbyterum* would be seen in synod or consistory, in conference with the Bishop upon the affairs of the Church, but not in the public liturgy. And when in course of time the Church came to possess the title to the houses which were given her by the pious and wealthy among her members, the service would not immediately expand into proportions such as to attract the notice and ill-will of the heathen. The conditions of the existence of

---

<sup>1</sup>Anti-Nicene Library, Vol. ii, p. 368.

Christianity forbade anything like what we understand by a Cathedral.

The erection and arrangement of Church edifices depends first of all on the power of the ecclesiastical corporation to acquire and possess real estate. But at what time, or how, the Christians under the Roman Empire obtained a title to property, or in whose hands the houses of assembly were, when made over formally to the Church, are questions which have not been investigated as they deserve. It is an ingenious conjecture that they were enabled to retain possession of the Catacombs or burying places, by being legally incorporated as burial societies or cemetery companies, and that for this reason the Catacombs were generally safe places of assembly. But this does not explain how they came to possess Churches in the cities. For neither was burial permitted in the cities, nor (considering Rome as the example which has been most fully investigated) were the Catacombs without the walls the earliest or common places of worship. The chapels in the Catacombs are too small, and their passages too narrow for the use of them by general congregations to have been otherwise than exceptional. And that the Churches had a different and independent origin is proved by that arrangement of the choir or sacrum which seems to have prevailed universally in the first period of Christian architecture, and of which not a few examples are still to be seen in Italian Churches. In the Catacomb chapel, where the Eucharist was offered on the tomb of a martyr, the space above the tomb was hollowed out into an *arcosolium*, and the priest of necessity stood with his back to the people, in *front* of the altar, whereas in the ancient Churches the Episcopal chair was placed *behind* the altar and the seats for the presbyters along the wall on either side of it, the altar being advanced to the chord of the apse, and the priest officiating with his face to the people. Nor was this arrangement brought in from the basilicas which are said to have been given to the Church by Constantine and his successors, since it is evident from the Apostolical Constitutions that it prevailed before the time of Constantine. And there is another feature of the primitive Church edifice which plainly points to a derivation from the private house,<sup>1</sup>—the *atrium*,

<sup>1</sup> Baedeker's Guide Book to Rome, gives this as the decision of the German antiquaries.

or space in front of the Church, enclosed with a high wall and surrounded with porticoes, as in San Clemente, Rome, and San Ambrogio, Milan—a feature which does not belong to the basilicas, but which is borrowed from the private house, as may be seen in the house of Livia on the Palatine, or in the plan of that structure given in Murray's Hand-book for Rome.<sup>1</sup>

But this is a digression. The Church's power to hold property depended in the first instance upon the legal status of the Christians themselves. But until the reign of Constantine their religion was unlawful and they themselves were proscribed. They were in the eye of the law as persons who had no right to exist. And having no legal status, they could have no corporate rights, or legal title to property for the use of the Church as such. And yet, as the law was compelled to connive at the existence of Christianity, so it was compelled after a while to connive in some way, by some legal fiction or other, at the Church's possession of real estate. The erection of the first buildings constructed for the use of the Church is conjecturally referred to the time of Alexander Severus, Emperor from A.D., 222 to 235. In his reign we are told, there happened a dispute between the Christians and some vintners about a certain public place, each party challenging it as their own; the Emperor determined it in favor of the Christians, saying that it was better God should be worshipped there after any manner, than that it should be given up to tavern-keepers. The place in dispute is said to have been the "Taberna Meritoria, a kind of Chelsea Hospital for old soldiers,"<sup>2</sup> and the site of the present Church of S. Maria in Trastevere, which is thus made out to be the first public Church in Rome. But if the Christians were able at this time to put in a claim for a piece of property against adverse litigants, they must have already entered upon possession of real estate and begun to erect buildings suitable to their wants; and therefore those "ancient buildings" of which Eusebius makes mention in the first chapter of his eighth book,

---

<sup>1</sup> Is not the square ended chancel of the English and Irish churches derived from the ancient assemblies in private houses, and a proof of the very early origin of the ancient British Church from which both received it—the apsidal chancel being unquestionably imitated from the basilicas? <sup>2</sup> Murray's Hand-book for Rome 2, p. 181.

are with great probability referred to this period. As time passes on the evidence becomes clearer, that the Church was acknowledged to have legal possession of its edifices. A rescript of Gallienus (A.D. 260-8) recorded by Eusebius, restores to the Christians their worshipping places, which had been taken from them in the persecution under Valerian.<sup>1</sup> Aurelian (A.D. 270-5) ejected Paul of Samosata from the "house of the Church" at Antioch, after he had been deposed by a Council. And Eusebius tells us that in the fifty years from Valerian to Diocletian, the number of the Christians had so increased that their ancient buildings were insufficient for them, and they erected from the foundations, more ample and spacious Churches in every city.

This period, then, is the earliest in which we may look for a Church which is distinctively the Bishop's Church. And it is to this period that the learned are agreed to assign the compilation of that remarkable work which is called the "Apostolic Constitutions," in the seventh section of the second book of which occurs a description of a Church and an assembly for worship, from which we make the following extracts:

When thou [i. e., the Bishop] callest an assembly of the Church, as one that is the commander of a great ship, appoint the assemblies to be made with all possible skill, charging the deacons as mariners to prepare places for the brethren as for passengers, with all due care and decency. And first, let the building be long, with its head to the East, with its vestries on both sides at the east end, and so it will be like a ship. In the middle let the bishop's throne be placed, and on each side of him let the presbytery sit down; and let the deacons stand near at hand in close and small girt garments, for they are like the mariners and managers of the ship: with regard to these, let the laity sit on the other side, with all quietness and good order. And let the women sit by themselves, they also keeping silence. In the middle let the reader stand upon some high place: let him read the Books of Moses, etc. \*\* Let the porters stand at the entries of the men and observe them. Let the deaconesses also stand at those of the women, etc., etc.

Now this would undoubtedly be the order of an assembly in which the Bishop officiated, surrounded with his presbyters, and in the presence of such a congregation as would be gathered in one of the more spacious churches of which Eusebius speaks as

---

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, vii, ch. 13.

built at the close of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. And this also would be the model to which the service would conform as nearly as possible in a Church where only a presbyter was officiating, of which there must be several in a city where there were several houses of worship, seeing that the Bishop could be present in but one at a time. But it cannot be proved from this passage that any one of such Churches was peculiarly the Bishop's Church or Cathedral, and we can see from many examples still existing in Italy, that all Churches were built with "the Bishop's throne in the midst, and the seats of the presbyters on each side of him," round the apse;—so that each Church was the Cathedral when the Bishop was there, and each was merely a parish church, when the Bishop was not there.

It does not appear, then, that in the ante-Nicene times any one church, in a city which contained more than one, was either in fact or name, the Cathedral. The *Cathedra* or see was placed in the city, but not particularly in any one Church of the city. Each Church was the Bishop's Church, and one no more than another. In the smaller cities, where there was a Bishop, but where one Church would accommodate the whole congregation, these would, of course, be the semblance of what was afterwards the Cathedral; it would be the Bishop's Church because it was the only Church. But in the larger cities, before the "peace of the Church" under Constantine, all the Churches were alike in their relation to the Bishop. Each of them was his Church—his Cathedral when he was present in it. Taking Rome once more as an example, there is no evidence that before the Bishop's *Cathedra* was set up in the Lateran, any other Church in Rome had that distinction; or that it was formerly translated from any other Church, when the Lateran Palace was given by Constantine to the Bishop of Rome for his residence, and the Lateran Basilica was built for his Cathedral. To the present day the Church of St. John Lateran takes precedence of St. Peter's, as well as of all other Churches in the Roman Communion, as *omnium ecclesiarum urbis et orbis mater et caput*; though St. Peter's is by far the grander and statelier, and is supposed to contain the tomb of the Apostle from whom the Pope claims his prerogatives. The reason is that the Lateran is the original Cathedral of the city, and dates



its pre-eminence from the time of Constantine or his immediate successors—ages before the Popes took up their residence at the Vatican and rebuilt St. Peter's. But if any other Church had had the precedence before St. John Lateran was built, we should have heard of some claim of privilege on its behalf; or at least should have had some record of the translation of the Cathedra.

The first Cathedrals in fact, were those great Churches built in the chief cities after the accession of Constantine, and chiefly by that Emperor or his sons, of which we have accounts in the historians of the period. Such was the Church of Paulinus at Tyre, of which Eusebius gives an account in the oration delivered at its dedication, and which he has preserved in his history. Such was the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, or rather of the Anastasis at Jerusalem. Such also was the Church at Antioch, at the dedication of which a Council was held in the Arian or Semi arian interest, which condemned St. Athanasius, and formulated the heretical "Creed of the Dedication." And such was the great Church at Alexandria, the occupation of which before its dedication was objected against Athanasius as a crime, against which he defended himself in an apology to the Emperor Constantius—mentioning in the apology, incidentally, that the Church was large enough to hold the whole congregation of Christians in Alexandria. From these examples, the building of large central churches spread to the other cities, and these in course of time became formally and by name the Cathedrals.

### III.

It is not necessary to our present purpose to trace the history of Cathedral edifices any further. It is sufficient to note that from this time it became universal to consider some one Church in the See-city the Bishop's Church, as that in which his official *sedes* or *Cathedra* was set up. We proceed now to consider the functions and attributes of the staff of clergy who surrounded the Bishop in the Cathedral, in their individual character of Canons, and in the collective character of the Cathedral Chapter.

It is evident, if what has been said is true,—and the fact is admitted by those who would refer the Cathedral to a

period earlier than that to which we have assigned it—that the distinction between the Cathedral clergy and the other clergy of the city or Diocese is a comparatively late development. The term *Canonici*, “inscribed on the *Canon, matricula* or *album* of the Church,” is said not to occur before the sixth century;<sup>1</sup> and then and for some ages after it was applied to all the clergy; while the term chapter (*capitulum*) was derived from the monasteries, where it was applied to that daily meeting in which the chapter of the monastic rule was read, and so came to denote the monastic assembly in general. Subsequently the term in this sense became limited to the Cathedral Chapter; the congregation of monks being called a convent (*conventus*) and a body of clergy living a common life but not attached to a Cathedral, a college (*collegium*).<sup>2</sup> The latter part of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth, may be set down as the earliest when the term chapter was applied to the cathedral clergy.<sup>3</sup> And it was not until a long time after this that it obtained that legal meaning which now attaches to it.

So much for the words. Now for the thing itself, the Cathedral Chapter, according to its fixed and known legal status, as defined by the Canon Law. And this we cannot better give than in the words of Chancellor Benson, whose excellent article (in Dean Howson's Volume) on the relation of the Chapter to the Bishop is well worthy the attention of all who are interested in the subject, and especially of those whose ignorance of ecclesiastical law inclines them to theories of Episcopal absolutism. He says;

It is not possible, to point to any episcopal chair which is not at once seen surrounded by its *senatus, presbyterium, consilium, or cardinales*. The word *capitulum* (chapter) expresses this identical body, but became fashionable only with the popularity of the monastic orders from whom it was adopted. \* \* \* The members of this council were naturally at first the *parochi civitatis*, presbyters and deacons of the city only;

<sup>1</sup> Benson, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> Lyndwood; cited Smith's Dict. Christ. Ant. art. *Capitulum*.

<sup>3</sup> In the Rule of Chrodegang it is called *congregatio canonicorum*. Haddan in Smith's Dict. Christ. Ant. art. Chapter says “these [canons] under the name of *capitula* are mentioned in Conc. Ver. [Verneuse] A.D., 755 can. 12. But this does not appear in Labbe's edition of the Councils.

here and there we find traces of their sharing the Bishops' table and purse; usually their maintenance was from the common Church fund, without a common establishment. \* \* \*

The principle of *common life and property* was never made absolute. \* \* \* At no time had the *cenobitic* life (however usefully introduced) any connection with the original and essential idea of the institution.

Neither is the *Daily Service* of such essence, according to the view of the canonists. Chapters have existed for centuries with no common office except on Sundays and certain festivals. And it is ruled that even these may be intermitted without destroying the capitular character. \* \* \*

Neither is the possession of common Property, or receipt of Stipends essential, nor the conduct of Divinity schools or Seminaries. All these particulars belong to cathedral chapters, but as the canonists say, only *per accidens*.

What is "*essential*," is briefly that they be "*Diocesis Senatus*," whose duty is "*auxiliari episcopo, sede plena: supplere, sede vacante.*"—[to help the Bishop the see being filled: to supply his place, the see being vacant.]

From these principles which have been historically observed with almost universal fidelity, it has been ruled to follow that a chapter, stripped of its property and withdrawn from liturgies would be a chapter still; but that a chapter deprived of the right of aiding the Bishop's work and supplying his place—though exercising every other function—would be excluded from the definition of a chapter. It would be a college of clerics, but not even the church (say all authorities) could rule that it was a chapter.<sup>1</sup>

Such is the fundamental idea of the Cathedral Chapter according to current Canon Law. Not Cathedral endowments, or stipends paid from Cathedral revenues, not Liturgies, not Cathedral or missionary work, not teaching or preaching constitute the functions, as so defined, of members of the Chapter; but from the most ancient times, according to the canonists, to be the Bishop's council of advice and helpers in his work is the function of the Chapter.

Now if this statement be accepted as defining the relation of a body of clergy to the Bishop, and if that body which does so counsel and help the Bishop be allowed, without regard to its constitution, to be a Cathedral Chapter; then the assertion that Bishops have never been without chapters may be permitted to stand, and to state a fundamental principle of Episcopal government. But if we look at the matter on the other side, and consider whether any such body of clergy as the modern chapter

<sup>1</sup> Essays on Cathedrals, p. 242-4.

existed in ancient times as a corporation apart from the other clergy of the city or diocese, we must answer in the negative, and assent to the statement of Mr. Haddan in his article on the "Chapter" in the new Dictionary of Christian Antiquities:

The functions of the Cathedral Chapter were simply derived, and (so to say) *usurped* from those of the original council of the bishop, viz., the Diocesan Clergy. And the eighth century may be taken as the period when the 'chapter' thus absorbed into itself the right of being the special council of the Bishop.

Here, then, is the practical question before us: In organizing our American Cathedrals, shall we adopt an institution which dates only from the eighth century, and which owes all its development to mediævalism; or shall we look for sounder principles of organization in the primitive Church?

One principle of Catholic Law we have reached. It is expressed in Canon twenty-two of the Fourth Council of Carthage, which was adopted into the code of the west, and thence into the *Decretum*, and acknowledged every where in the west. "The Bishop shall hear no cause without the presence of his clergy; otherwise the sentence of the Bishop will be void unless it be confirmed by the sentence of his clergy."<sup>1</sup>

But all the canonists agree that the primitive Chapter, for so they call it by analogy, was not any exclusive body, but the whole company of clergy of the city, or of the Diocese—it being the Diocesan Synod, when attended by the country clergy, and the Cathedral Chapter when attended by the city clergy only.

Van Espen begins Title viii of his First Part, which treats of Cathedral Chapters in this way:

In the first ages of the rising Church the Presbyters and Deacons having cure of souls in the Episcopal city, constituted, so to speak, one body with the Bishop; and therefore, as that Apostolical man, the blessed Ignatius the martyr, writing to the Magnesians, says; they are in the place of the senate of the Apostles. And in the Epistle to the Trallians, he calls them the Sacred Consistory, Counsellors and Assessors of the Bishop. Of whom, also, Jerome says, in Isaiah iii: "We also have in

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomassin de Beneficiis, Vol. i, p. 362. Van Espen, Pars I, Title viii, c. iv., 2. Under our system the standing committee is the council of advice to the Bishop, and he is able by consulting it to obey the rule after a fashion. But the standing committee might very well give way to a more primitive organization.

the Church our senate, the assembly of the Presbyters." In subsequent ages, the number of Presbyters and Clergy gradually increasing, the Bishops began to choose out certain from the clergy, and to assign them peculiarly to himself,<sup>1</sup> by whose counsel and labor he ruled his Diocese; whom a later age called Cathedral Canons, and their assembly the Cathedral Chapter, as more nearly adhering to the Episcopal Cathedra; for what things were originally, according to the canons, to be treated of and resolved by the Bishop, with the counsel and consent of the clergy, at length began to be treated of and resolved with the advice and consent of the Chapter, the rest of the clergy being neglected.<sup>2</sup>

Thomassin, who treats of the subject at length in his great work *De Beneficiis*, has much to the same effect :

The word *Chapter* here does not sound, but the thing itself cries aloud. For truly the Chapter of every Bishop and Cathedral church was that clergy, those presbyters and deacons who deliberated with the Bishop concerning all affairs, who ruled the Church with the one power of the Keys, who treated of causes and judgment in his name, who with him sat or stood in synods, who in his name and place were present in particular councils and were conspicuous in General Councils. Not the sound of the words, but the sense is here to be attended to. (He then quotes Jerome, as above; Basil, "the Sanhedrim of the Presbytery of the city;" Cyprian, "From the beginning of my Episcopate I have laid it down as a law to do nothing privately by my own sentence, without your counsel and the consent of the people," and adds:) From these examples it is manifest that in the first ages of the Church, the superior clergy<sup>3</sup> coalesced in a kind of council and senate of the Bishop, and were engaged in the administration of the Church, as well spiritual as temporal. This, then, was the primitive nature of Chapters, and these were their duties. They did not use a common dormitory or table, as neither do they now; but they possessed in common all the goods of the Church, of which so much was distributed to each one, as agreed with his needs, his order and his work. \* \* \* \* \* But the principle differences between that most ancient clergy, and the Chapters of to-day were of this sort:

- 1.—That clergy consisted only of Presbyters and Deacons.
- 2.—These Presbyters and Deacons were themselves the parochial clergy and pastors of all the Churches of the city, or if they were not yet separated from the Cathedral parish, they fulfilled in it all the duties of parochial clergy.
- 3.—They obtained their rank and dignity by their ordination. For the presbyterate and the diaconate, equally with the Episcopate were benefices, not merely orders;

---

<sup>1</sup> Van Espen is unhistorical in this remark. The process, as Dr. Benson says in the passage quoted below was otherwise.

<sup>2</sup> Van Espen, Pars I, Title viii, ch. i, 1.

<sup>3</sup> That is the Presbyters and Deacons, who are called "superior" as distinguished from the minor orders.



and they were benefices of that sort to which belonged the cure of the salvation of souls after their own certain mode.

Even now, the clergy of the Roman Church, show forth the most splendid and express form of that clergy which formerly was joined with the Bishop in all Cathedral Churches. For the clergy of the Roman Pontiff consists of Cardinal-Presbyters and Deacons, or the titular parochial clergy of the parish Churches of Rome, agreeing and laboring in the Roman consistory with and under the Pontiff in all matters which, because of the Pontifical spiritual rule, are referred to Rome from the entire Christian world.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Benson sums up the matter, correcting Van Espen, thus :

A synod was an assembly of the clerks of the Diocese, lawfully summoned, under the Bishop, for questions concerning their own Diocese. Canonists hold that to original frequent meetings of this kind, there succeeded by steps, as numbers increased, the council of the clergy of the city, and finally of the Cathedral. It would be more exact to say that the original meetings were those of the clergy of the city, gradually adding to their numbers [i. e. by missionary work] the clergy of the neighborhood and those of the Diocese, while they themselves answered to, and often became the cathedral clergy, or rather the canonical body. The synod was an expanded Chapter, and the Chapter a condensed synod. Although this is too *symmetrical* a statement to represent more than the merest outline of events as a historical process, still it presents in the clearest form, the fact that there was no difference in character, or in subjects of discussion between the synod and the Chapter.<sup>2</sup>

Now it is evident from these testimonies that the primitive council of the Bishop was *not* a Cathedral Chapter in the mediæval or modern sense ; but instead thereof, that assembly of clergy which is known to students of Christian antiquity as the *corona presbyterium*—a concourse of the ordinary pastors of the city, who with the Bishop transacted the affairs of the Church in the city, and by whose advice he governed his diocese—the country clergy not being excluded by any rule, but not usually being present, because not residing in the city.

And this, it seems to us must be an element in the Cathedral institutions of the American Church, if we would reap that benefit of close organization and united action which we so much want in the general extra-parochial work of our cities, which we so much desire, and which it is hoped the Cathedral will supply. In other words, the Cathedral must be *inclusive* on the primitive

<sup>1</sup> Thomassin De Beneficiis, I, B. iii. ch. vii, 7, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Essays on Cathedrals, p. 250, -1.

plan, and not *exclusive* on the mediæval plan. Each clergyman, or at least each Rector in the city must be *ex officio* a canon of the Cathedral, having his own stall in the choir, and his own seat in the Chapter. For what is it we hope to accomplish by the Cathedral? Is it not the ordering and unifying the work in the city? And can this be done by isolating the Bishop from his co-laborers in the city churches, and guarding him from conference with them—entrenching him in the midst of a *clerical clique* attached to some one church, and whose interests are antagonistic to the interests of the parishes by which it is surrounded?

The reference above to the college of Cardinals of the Roman see admirably illustrates the vitality and also the effectiveness of the primitive organization. For however widely it has departed in spirit from the original institution, it adheres with Roman tenacity to the external form. Although additions have been made from time to time to the number of the Cardinals, yet in theory the college is still the ancient *corona presbyterium* of the Roman see. The foreign prelates who are admitted into the consistory take their titles from the old parish churches, and appear there as Rectors of those churches. Dr. Manning, though a Romish Archbishop in England, is in Rome only Cardinal Presbyter of Saint Gregory, and Cardinal McCloskey sinks his arch-episcopal title in like manner, when he enters the conclave. Certainly no Cathedral Chapter has ever exhibited the activity of the college of Cardinals.

#### IV.

The changes which broke up the primitive organization and introduced the Cathedral Chapter as an *exclusive* body, may be clearly traced in the canons of councils from the fifth to the eighth century. Three causes appear on the surface co-operating to that effect; the first, the exclusion from the business of the Diocese, and therefore from the Bishop's council, of those who derived their support from special endowments or offerings in the parish churches; the second, the tendency to a monastic or cenobitic life, on the part of an unmarried clergy; the third and most powerful, the appointment of the Bishops by the Emperor or the King. But one occult cause includes them all, and gave them

their power—the loss of the Church's liberty through its union with the State.

It is a commonplace in ecclesiastical history that the support of the clergy in the primitive period was derived from a common fund, into which all the revenues of the Church were thrown, and which was divided into three or four parts—one for the bishop, the others for the clergy and edifices—to which was added, when the division was fourfold, the relief of the poor. In the fifth century the change to special endowments or appropriations was well under way. Now from the nature of the case, the country churches would be the first to have separate revenues secured to them, and that for two reasons; first, because it would be inconvenient to send the offerings, specially such as were made in kind, to the common fund, merely to bring them back again; and secondly, because the right of patronage assumed by the laity with respect to these Churches implied their special endowment and support by the patrons.<sup>1</sup> But when a clergyman was settled in a country place, and derived all his support from the Church there, and had all his interests there, his presence at meetings of the clergy in the city would become less and less frequent, until, as was finally the case, canons were necessary to compel his attendance at the annual synod of the Diocese.<sup>2</sup>

In fact, the distinction between city and country, as it is founded in the nature of things, led to a distinction between city and country churches and clergy as soon as country clergy existed. Thus the twelfth canon of the council of Neocæsarea forbids a country clergyman to officiate in a city church, if there is a city presbyter present; a rule which seems harsh and unchristian, but which probably was intended to protect the man from being despised for his rustic manners by the fastidious refinement of the city. In other respects the country presbyter had privileges which

---

<sup>1</sup> Hence the rule of the Canon law, that foundation of a church without endowment does not entitle the founder to present a clerk to it.

<sup>2</sup> Such a Canon was that which required the priest to obtain the chrism for all the baptisms of the year from the bishop in person on Maundy Thursday. This implied keeping Easter in the city and the attempt to gather the whole Diocese together once a year, for the Easter solemnities.

the city presbyter had not. He could administer baptism, whereas all baptisms in the city were ordinarily reserved to the Bishop. And this explains a curious passage in the Life of Pope Marcellus in the *Liber Pontificalis*: "Hic viginti quinque titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi *Diœceses*, propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum, qui convertebantur ex Paganis, et propter sepulturas martyrum,"<sup>1</sup> where *Diœcesis* is equivalent to *Diœcesana ecclesia*, that is, a country Church, as will be demonstrated shortly. The sense, therefore is, that Marcellus constituted in the city of Rome, twenty-five *tituli* or churches, to be, like the country churches, for baptism and the penance of many who were converted from Paganism, etc.<sup>2</sup> And they had the liberty of consecrating the Eucharist, when that privilege was denied to the presbyters of the city, as appears from the letter of Innocent I. to Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium.

"De Fermento vero, quod die Dominica per titulos, (i. e. the city churches) mittimus, superfluo nos consulero voluisti, cum omnes Ecclesiæ nostræ intra civitatem sint constitutæ. Quarum Presbyteri quia die ipsa propter plebem sibi creditam nobiscum convenire non possunt, idcirco Fermentum a nobis confectum per Acolythos accipiunt, ut se a nostra communione maxima illa die non judicent separatos. Quod per parochias (i. e. the country churches) fieri debere non puta, quia nec longe portanda sunt sacramenta, nec nos per cœmeteria diversa (i. e. the catacombs which seem therefore to have been considered country churches) constitutis Presbyteris destinamus, et presbyteri eorum conficiendorum jus habeant atque licentiam."<sup>3</sup>

The city and country clergy therefore, stood from the first in somewhat different relations to the Bishop—relations which necessitated their gathering round him in different bodies, of which the one included the other, the Diocesan synod, and the city Chapter, or, to speak *Romano more* the college of Cardinals.

And here it is to be remarked, that during the period we are now considering, the term *parochialis ecclesia* (for which also *parochia* was used) as well as *Diœcesana ecclesia*, (or *diœcesis* as its

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Thomassin, i., ii. 22, 11.

<sup>2</sup> The *Liber Pontificalis*, it is well-known is unhistorical; but its language may be discussed.

<sup>3</sup> Thomassin Ib. ch. 21, 6. The Letter is in Labbe. The "Fermentum" is acknowledged by Thomassin and by Dupin to be the Eucharist.

equivalent), simply meant a *country church* as distinguished from a *city church*, which was a *basilica*, or *titulus*;<sup>1</sup> and that *presbyteri parochiales* were the presbyters attached to country churches, as those attached to city churches were *presbyteri cardinales*; and it was not until the original meaning of the word had been forgotten, that *city parishes* began to be spoken of. The word *Παροικίας* is used in this sense in the 17th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon. So in Canon 21 of the Council of Agatho, A. D. 506: "Si quis etiam extra parochias in quibus legitimus est ordinariusque conventus, oratorium in agro habere voluerit," he may keep the minor festivals at home, but the greater festivals "non nisi in civitatibus aut in parochiis teneant," etc. And in Conc. Vasense, A. D. 529, there is the same opposition of the terms which fixes and demonstrates their meaning: "Non solum in civitatibus sed etiam in omnibus parochiis verbum faciendi daremus presbyteris potestatem." And this explains two facts which have puzzled us not a little: how the change came about by which the term *parochia* is now used to denote the priest's jurisdiction, when it originally denoted the territory of the Bishop; and how the term *Diæcesis*, which was a division of the Empire and the Church, including many Provinces, came to designate the jurisdiction of a single Bishop; so that whereas formerly the Diocese included many Provinces, now the Province includes many Dioceses. The matter becomes clear when we observe that the Bishop's *parochia* was distinguished from his *sedes* or see; the *sedes* being the *civitas* or city, and the *parochia* being the country round it. The churches in the country, therefore, were called *parochiales ecclesiæ*, and the term *Diocesanæ ecclesiæ* was used in exactly the same sense. Hence, in course of time, by an unconscious change of meaning, the Bishop, when he visited the *diocesanæ ecclesias* was understood to visit the churches of his Diocese, and when he visited the *parochiales ecclesias*, he was understood to visit the parishes of his priests. But the parochial churches originally, as was said, were the country or rural churches; and this being understood, the Canons of the Councils plainly show us their history. An examination of these shows that the parochial

---

<sup>1</sup> Whence our word, *title*. "No clergyman to be ordained without a title."



system originated in the country, and was a necessary result of the fact that there is an inherent distinction between the *sedes* and the *parochia*—the city and the country. And this distinction rises to the value of a principle to be taken account of in our own efforts at bettering our ecclesiastical organization, separating by a natural and necessary division, the Bishop's *corona presbyterium* into two bodies, the Diocesan synod and the City Chapter.<sup>1</sup>

This was in a manner primitive. But the parochial system was at length introduced into the cities. Bingham notes that the revenues of the Churches they served were assigned to the clergy of Constantinople in the year 460, and the custom spread elsewhere in the period we are considering. For although in the canons cited above, there are but two, and those both of the same Council, (Cone. Orleans A.D. 538, c. 5 to 18,) which provide for special stipends to the clergy serving City Churches other than the Cathedral, yet this is no argument that the process was not going on. The principle of the common fund would remain longest in force in the city, because the city is a unit. But as the custom of separate endowments<sup>2</sup> gained ground, and the meaning of the term "parochial Church" changed, the city Churches which had separate maintenance would be considered parish Churches, and of course come under the Canons regulating them; so that they too would fall away from the Cathedral and its Chapter.

Another fact must be noted. The parochial system grew up, as we have seen, outside of the Common Endowment, and without essentially diminishing it, except in the few cases where the Bishop, with the consent of his Clergy, appropriated a fiftieth or hundredth part to the endowment of a Monastery or parish Church. What, then, became of this Common Fund? It remained in the name of the Bishop, as the joint property of the Bishop and his Cathedral Canons. In process of time it was divided up into

---

<sup>1</sup> A synopsis of the legislation of Councils during the 6th and 7th centuries, substantiating the assertion in the text, which was prepared for insertion here, is omitted for want of space.—ED.

<sup>2</sup>By endowment we mean any constant source of revenue. A Church may be "endowed" with the offerings made at its altar when these are secured to it and not to the Common Fund.

the separate estates of the Bishop, the Corporation and the Canons. But at this period, it was still *de jure* the Common Fund of the Diocese, and *de facto* the estate of the Bishop, who assigned the stipends paid from it to the clergy of the Cathedral. In other words, the Cathedral, or Bishop's Church, appropriated the whole of this ancient Common Endowment. It followed from this, however, that whatever rights of deliberation and consent remained to the Clergy, as the Bishop's Council, in the administration of this endowment, appertained to the Cathedral Clergy only. And it was natural to infer that parochial clergy who had no interest in the Common Fund, had no place whatever in that Council, a part at least of whose duty and right it was to advise concerning and to scrutinize its expenditure.

## V.

The tendency to a cœnobitic life, which became a necessity for a corps of men who were denied the society of wife and children, and which was pressed upon them by the example of the monasteries, co-operated powerfully to this separation of the Cathedral clergy from the rest of the Diocese, and assisted in the destruction of the old *corona presbyterium*. Wherever there was a Church served by an unmarried clergy numerous enough to constitute a society, there was this tendency, and that among the more devout and religious men, both for protection against temptation, and for mutual comfort and refreshment. In some instances as is related of Eusebius of Vercelli, of Epiphanius, and of Martin of Tours, the Bishop himself adopted the monastic profession, so far as was consistent with the duties of his office, and surrounded himself in the Episcopal residence with a body of monks, among whom he numbered as many of his clergy as he could induce to join him in that way of life. Others, like St. Augustine, lived in common with their clergy, without adopting a monastic rule. Gelasius I. is said to have founded, about the close of the 5th century, an establishment of "canons regular" in the Lateran Church. The second Council of Toledo, A. D. 531, speaks of schools conducted by the "canonici," wherein the scholars lived "in domo ecclesiæ sub Episcopi præsentia;" and the Third Coun-

cil of Toledo orders the Scriptures to be read aloud "in the refectory of the priests," (*sacerdotali convivio*). A similar phrase, "*mensa canonica*," is quoted by Du Cange from Gregory of Tours, in speaking of the *canonici* established by Baudinus, Archbishop of Tours in the 6th century, and from a charter granted by Chilperic in 580.<sup>1</sup>

The steps in the growth of the Cathedral Chapter as a quasi-monastic body are thus given in the new and valuable Dictionary of Christian Antiquities:

1. As a natural result of their distance from the Bishop's residence, the country presbyters and deacons became in effect, although never formally, excluded from the Episcopal Council or (so to call it by anticipation) Chapter.

2. At Rome, this state of things became permanent, so that all the city clergy, and they only, became the Chapter; and hence, after a lapse of centuries, and some other changes, the Cardinal-Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

3. In general, however, time brought about two further but equally gradual changes. The Bishop and his more immediate clergy took to living a life in common, although each still retained his own special share of Church goods and lived upon it. And thus the town clergy in general became separated from those who specially served the Cathedral, but had no cure in the city itself. And the Chapter, (so to call it) became gradually restricted to the latter, viz.: the *Cathedrales* proper, to the exclusion of the former, or general body of the town clergy; a right disused, as before, ceasing naturally in time to be recognized as a right at all.

4. The *Cathedrales* themselves became increased in number by the addition of various diocesan officers; as, e. g., the archdeacon, archpresbyter, primicerius or custos, scholastics (or chancellor); or again, through the musical services of the Cathedral, the archicantor (or precentor); and through the engrafting upon the Bishop's establishment of seminaries for youths and clergy, the *præpositus* or provost. And thus a body of officers grew up, who through their position and special attachment to the Bishop and the Cathedral, helped yet more to exclude outsiders.

5. Two further changes, however, were needed, in order to complete the establishment of the modern Chapter: 1. The appointment of a dean, which grew out of the office of *præpositus*. \* \* \* 2. The conversion of the prebends, (in fact though not in name) into benefices. (These last changes however, were subsequent to the period embraced in this article and pertain to the Mediæval Institution.)

Now however advisable this restriction of a celibate clergy to a semi-monastic life might be, as regards the clergy themselves, one thing cannot escape us. So complete a separation from the laity and from all interests outside the cloister, as the cloister de-

<sup>1</sup> Smith, Dict. Christian Antiquities, art. *canonici*.

mands, must have been fatal to all true pastoral work among the people, as well as to any wide sympathies of the clergy for each other. And thus we reach the extreme result of that exclusiveness which disintegrated the primitive organization of the city and the Diocese. In view of this abnegation of pastoral work, we are inclined to look upon the Canonical Rule of Chrodegang of Metz, which contemplated an application to the whole body of the clergy, which fixed the form of Cathedral Chapters for some time, and which, if we remember rightly, contains not one word regulating the pastoral work of the clergy among the laity, rather as a despairing effort to entrench what remained of Christianity behind the walls of the cloister, than as of the nature of a real reform. It was in fact, an abandonment of the people, so far as any real teaching and influence were concerned; and so it came about that the Bishop's Council and Senate, whose duty was "*auxiliari Episcopo, sede plena; supplere, sede vacante,*" was composed of Cathedral Canons, a part of whose definition in the Canon Law to this day is that they are "without cure of souls."<sup>1</sup>

## VI.

One other circumstance completed the destruction of the primitive institution, and, so to speak, ran the plough-share over its foundations. The age in which these changes were taking place was an evil age. The barbarians had overrun the West, and had thrown all things into confusion. Learning was dead. The monasteries had not yet become the store-houses of the treasures saved from the wreck of antiquity, nor the seminaries of such original thought as took form in the later scholasticism. The parochial clergy in their isolation failed to reach even a low ideal of Christian living, and the Cathedral Chapters, as we have seen, were hiding behind monastic grates to avoid the temptations which assailed them. But the Bishoprics fared worse than all. Converted theoretically into spiritual lordships, they became actually secular baronies; they fell a prey to the rapacity of princes and

---

<sup>1</sup> Even "*Deaneries*" are sinecures, that is, they have not cure of souls. Burns' *Ecclesiastical Law*, vol. ii, p. 82.

nobles; they were filled with turbulent soldiers and intriguing politicians; and their occupants found their sphere of duty in court and camp, rather than in Cathedral and cloister. The Common Fund was no longer the property even of a close corporation; it became the spoil of the secularized ecclesiastics who obtained the great benefices of the Church at the hands of the temporal power. In this state of matters, we may be sure that the Cathedral Chapters were not fulfilling the functions assigned to the *corona presbyterium* by St. Ignatius, "the sacred consistory, counsellors and assessors of the Bishops," for the Bishops would endure no assessors, and would accept of no advice. The primitive institution had perished, except at Rome, which never fell completely under the domination of the Barbarians.

That eminent Statesman, M. Guizot, in the thirteenth of his invaluable lectures on the history of civilization in France, enlarges upon the following heads as a summary of the condition of the Church in the 8th century:

1. The whole government of the Church at this period was in the hands of the Bishops and of the Priests; but the general manifest fact was the exclusive domination and despotism of the Bishops.

2. The fall of the Metropolitans left the Bishops without superiors, or very nearly so. With the head of the ecclesiastical Province declined the Provincial synod.

3. Kings nominated the Bishops. There resulted from this another circumstance which still more separated the Bishops from their Priests: When the clergy elected them it took them from its own bosom; it selected men already known and accredited in the Diocese. When, on the contrary, a crowd of Bishops received their title from Kings, the greater part arrived strangers, unknown, alike without credit and without affection among the clergy whom they had to govern.

4. The clergy declined; a great number of slaves (or serfs) entered into the Church. The Bishops soon perceived that a clergy thus formed was without principle, without power, far more easy to govern, and to conquer if it attempted to resist. In many Dioceses they took care to recruit it from the same source.

5. The Bishops were the sole administrators of the property of the Church.



6. They disposed of persons almost as of things, and the liberty of the parish Priests was scarcely better guaranteed than their revenue.

7. The political importance of the Bishops turned equally to the profit of their religious domination.

After some remarks on the *resistance* which could be offered to this despotism of the Episcopate, M. Guizot concludes the lecture as follows :

The extracts here given are amply sufficient to prove the oppression and the resistance, the evil and the attempt to remedy it; the resistance was abortive, the remedy ineffectual: Episcopal despotism continued to take deeper and wider root. Thus at the commencement of the eighth century, the Church had fallen into a state of disorder almost equal to that prevalent in civil society. Without superiors, without inferiors at all to be dreaded—relieved from the superintendence of the Metropolitans and of the Councils, rejecting the influence of the priests—a crowd of Bishops were seen yielding themselves up to the most scandalous excesses. Masters of the ever-increasing wealth of the Church, ranking among the great landed proprietors, they adopted their interests and their manners; they relinquished their ecclesiastical character and led a wholly secular life; they kept hounds and falcons, they went from place to place surrounded by an armed retinue, they took part in the national warfare; nay more, they undertook from time to time, expeditions of violence and rapine against their neighbors on their own account. A crisis was inevitable; everything prepared the necessity for reformation, everything proclaimed it, and you will see, in point of fact, shortly after the accession of the Carlovingsians, an attempt at reformation was made by the civil power. But the Church herself contained the germ of a remedy; side by side with the secular clergy there had been rising up another order, influenced by other principles, animated with another spirit, and which seemed destined to prevent that dissolution with which the Church was menaced. I speak of the monks.<sup>1</sup>

What M. Guizot says is perfectly true. The course which events had taken seemed to have demonstrated the failure of that ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons instituted by our blessed Lord, and turned the hopes of men for ages afterwards to that purely human invention, the Monastery. The first effort at a reform of the clergy was the attempt of Chrodegang to assimilate the *canonical* to the *monastic* rule; and it is from this that the Mediæval Cathedral Chapter takes its rise. Chrodegang's Rule forms the water shed, so to speak, between two different systems,

---

<sup>1</sup> Guizot, Hist. Civ. vol. ii., p. 268-78.

the Primitive and the Mediæval. The change is marked by a change in the idea attached to the word "canon," which heretofore has meant one inscribed on the roll of the Church; but which henceforth means, one subjected to a Canon or Rule. This article is already too long to enter upon an analysis of that Rule; it will form a fitting introduction to a future attempt to trace the progress of the Mediæval institution. We have already characterized it as a despairing effort to rescue the clergy from the wreck to which it seems to abandon the laity. It was taken up, however, by the great reforming Emperor, Charlemagne, and from it by gradual modification, there issued forth a Cathedral organization less monastic and better suited to the needs of a Church, which though it awoke to new life and activity, did so under conditions as different to those of the Primitive Church as Imperialism and Papalism could make them.

The real cause which lay behind this extinction of the corporate consciousness of the Church, and of its effectiveness as a united and powerful institution was the union of Church and State. The phenomena we have traced must all be referred back to the surrender of the primitive flexibility and freedom for the political privileges with which the State gilded the chains of the Church's slavery. There was not a privilege granted by the State which did not sap some of the Church's liberties, and deprive it of some of its power. A re-adjustment was therefore inevitable; and the events of which we have taken a hurried review were but minor incidents in a revolution which changed the whole character and condition of the Church. The period we have gone over was the period of decay. With Charlemagne began the period of reconstruction. But the institutions reformed and reconstructed, thus entering upon a new course of development which led through the Papal epoch to that which we call "the Reformation," were institutions adapted to a Church of which the distinctive characteristic was that it was *not* as the Primitive Church—and which, therefore is not a fit model for us who are once more in the Primitive position, free from the State.

## VII.

Amid all these changes, however, certain fundamental principles

continued theoretically to govern, and preserved a legal and constitutional vitality. These principles, coming down from the earliest ages, and applied to various conditions in various ways, preserve an essential identity under accidental differences, and so vindicate their catholic character. Among such principles are these appertaining to Cathedral organization:

1. That the Bishop is not an autocrat.
2. That he is surrounded by a Council composed of the clergy under his Episcopate, and not without lay influence, whose right and duty it is, "*auxiliari Episcopo, sede plena; supplere, sede vacante.*"
3. That as regards the Constitution of this Council there is a natural difference between the *sedes* and the *parochia*, the city and the country, which of necessity makes it twofold: the Synod of the Diocese, and the Chapter of the city.

The Diocesan Synod we have in full working order. The question to be solved is, What shall be the Chapter of the city? Shall it be the "college of Cardinals," the "sacred consistory" of St. Ignatius, composed of clergy having cure of souls in all the churches of the city? Or shall it be the semi-monastic Mediæval Chapter, without cure of souls, without pastoral experience—shut in by a rood-screen from association with their brethren of the clergy and the laity? Or shall it, being neither of these, be an anomalous invention—the staff of a Parish which has decorated itself with the name of a Cathedral, and calls itself the Bishop's Church, to the exclusion of the other churches of the Diocese—assistants of the Bishop as a Parish Rector, recommended to him by their cheapness—a qualification inconsistent with the character of scholars and gentlemen—flatterers by position, with narrow sympathies and selfish instincts—a *clique*, whose professional occupation as trusted counsellors must be to set the Bishop against his clergy, and the clergy against their Bishop?

JOHN H. EGAR.

## NEW VERSION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

No other part of the New Testament is so entwined with the daily thoughts of earnest Christians as the Lord's Prayer. Any change, therefore, in its familiar expressions, which are so rooted in the memory, and grafted inwardly in the hearts of those who love to use them in all their devotions, should be proposed only after the most careful reflection, as the result at once of mature judgment and profound learning. These are the first thoughts suggested by a new version of the Lord's Prayer, with explanatory comments, recently published in more than one Church paper, as "literally translated from the original Greek or Sinaitic manuscript:"

"Our Father, who art in the heavens, hallowed be Thy name, Let Thy kingdom come, Let Thy will happen, as in heaven, upon earth also. Give us to-day our bread which is for the coming day : and remit to us our debts, as we also have remitted to our debtors. And do not take us into trial, but deliver us from the Evil One."

And this is one of many similar attempts at new versions of that and other portions of Holy Scripture. Is, then, this new translation, or any such version, of the Lord's Prayer, a fair specimen, or a possible foreshadowing, of some of the changes to be brought out by the Revision of the English Bible? If it is, then the claims of such changes, expressed in occasional comments of their advocates, ought to be freely discussed, and every error distinctly challenged. And if it is not, still such errors should be confuted. For the proposed Revision of the English Bible has already gained some premature confidence, through the frequent utterance of such crudities; which, to many who do not at once discern the defects of every wordy criticism, seem to disclose numerous faults in the Authorized Version of the Bible.

In the new translation of the Lord's Prayer, precisely copied above, every one of the eleven changes suggested is a palpable

mistake, or a change too trivial to be called a mistake. And not one of all the comments, by which these changes are explained, is well put or correct. Yet they are set forth in high-sounding words, as authoritative criticism, not to be called in question by any. They suffice, however, to reveal the great need of a more general knowledge of the first principles of grammatical and critical exposition.

Every accurate linguist knows that a literal translation from one language to another, is very difficult; limited to single words, and to a small number of the words of any language. It is impossible to translate literally so many words and clauses as those of the Lord's prayer; even when, as in this case, some of the expressions are idiomatically common to various languages. This appears from the first comment made by the author of this new translation; where, having suggested, as a literal rendering of the first clause, these words, "Our Father the (one) in the heavens," he says: "But this being hardly good English, I have rendered by the words 'who art,' as is done in the Authorized Version."<sup>1</sup> But why did he not revise the first word, "Our," and render the Greek words, "*Πατερ ἡμῶν*," "Father of us?" This is the literal translation of those words. The phrase, "Our Father," would be a literal rendering of other Greek; *Πατερ ἡμετερος*, or *Πατερ ἡμετερε*. But this is not the Greek of the Lord's Prayer in the New Testament. So clearly impossible it is, and not merely difficult, to translate, literally even a few words of idiomatic Greek into idiomatic, intelligible English. The only method of true, or accurate translation of the Greek of the New Testament, as of any other book, in any language whatever, is to give the real sense of phrases, and not to strain and wrench single words out of their connections with other words, by rendering them always, or frequently, according to the leading definitions of certain Lexicons.

The error of thus assuming a primary sense, and using it as the literal and plainest meaning of a word, is well shown by the amusing remark of a French lady at Rome to an American clergyman: "You Americans will eat a whole kitchen," (*Fr. cuisine*.) That plain-spoken French woman caught at the primary, literal sense of *cuisine*, merely because she did not know, or could not recollect, any of the other English renderings which would have precisely

<sup>1</sup> An error, the authorized version reads "which art."



expressed her meaning and yet saved her politeness. But she was wise and reasonable, compared with those Biblical critics, who insist upon literal rendering of Greek words in a revision of the English Bible, or dream of a uniform rendering of any word, except *θεός*, God.

But the difficulty of a strictly literal translation, and the impossibility of translating Greek or Latin into English without circumlocution, the dullest tyro soon learns, from the frequent use of the English verbs, *have*, *do*, *will* and *let*, as auxiliary verbs, while the corresponding verbs in Greek and Latin are used only as principal verbs; and from the peculiar English use of the auxiliary *shall*, which is not only a part of the future tense, but sometimes also bears the potential sense of the imperative mood.

The fond conceit of accuracy in an attempted distinction between "Heaven" and "the heavens," from the singular and plural of the Greek *οὐρανός*, does not require particular attention here. Nor is it necessary to show to scholars that the insertion of the word "let" in the clause "Thy kingdom come," is far from making the translation of that clause more literal. But in the next clause, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven," not only is the new translation made less literal, again, by the word "let;" But the very queer phrase, "Let Thy will happen," is backed by a comment hardly less queer; a fair example of the superficial criticism of those who attempt to translate literally. The new translator asserts that "the verb which the Authorized Version translates 'be done,' is not the imperative passive of the verb 'to do,' but a word which signifies, in its primitive and most literal possible rendering, *to come into being*, often *to be born*; and hence the idea seems to be, 'Let that which thou wishest, (Thy will) take place;' the verb used by the original writer expressing rather the *occurrence* of an *event*, than the *performance* of God's wishes by agents, whether animate or inanimate."

All this show of criticism, however, cannot set aside the fact, that the Greek verb *γινῶμαι*, which is translated "be done" in the Lord's Prayer of the Authorized Version, is well translated by the passive of the verb *to do*, in other places. The same word also expresses in the New Testament the *performance* of God's will by agents, animate and inanimate, as well as the occurrence of events;

by whatever agencies or means they may be brought to pass, and by whatever logic the will of the Lord Almighty, or the wishes of the Supreme, may be supposed to "happen." This appears, beyond dispute, from John i. 3, where this same word, *γινωμαι*, is translated by the passive of the verb *to make*, in this declaration: "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

But further: The Greek verb *ποιεω*, which, in its strictest, most specific sense, like the Latin *facio*, signifies *to make* and *to do*, is translated in the Authorized Version, by not less than twenty-seven distinct renderings; all so precise in their several connections that hardly a single one could be set aside with safety, by a multitude of counsellors greatly outnumbering those who have associated themselves in committees, for the work of revision. It is a pity, then, if the word *γινωμαι*, which, in its most specific sense, signifies "to come into being," may not sometimes be translated by the passive of the verbs *to make* and *to do*.

But here the literal translator attempts to establish a distinction between "Heaven," as the singular of *ουρανος*, without the article, and "the heavens," as the plural with the article; apparently not aware that our Lord used the plural, *ουρανοις*, in Matt. xvi. 19, in the phrase, "bound in Heaven" and "loosed in Heaven," and then, in Matt. xviii. 18, used the singular, *ουρανω*, in the same connection, and with the same meaning. As to the use and force of the Greek article, it is only necessary to say that the instances in which it denotes any important distinction in words which may also be used without it, are comparatively rare, both in the New Testament and in more ancient Greek. And its value, as an element in Biblical exegesis, is often immensely overrated, as any one may see by looking at the places in which the word *απρος*, bread, is used; sometimes with the article, and sometimes without, as if that had no special force, in any of those places.

It is needless to show by any further view of the word *ουρανος*, in the New Testament, that the assumed distinction between the singular and the plural of that word is wholly imaginary. But the hyper-criticism, which would fault the translators of the Authorized Version, because they omitted the word "also," a frequent rendering of the Greek *και*, from the clause, "Thy will be done in

earth," illustrates, if it does not also betray, the deep dislike of good, plain English, which seems to prompt many an effort of literal translators in these days. For how could any English-speaking scholar fail to observe that the proper order of words in good, simple English, which is not so inverted as the Greek, makes the word "also," there, not only needless to the sense, but utterly pedantic and preposterous? In fact, the force of the Greek *καί* in that place, is secured by the very position of the conjunction "as," which thus at once fully translates into plain perfect English, both of the Greek particles, *ὥς* and *καί*.

As to the clause translated, "Give us to-day our bread, which is for the coming day," after all the discussion by ancient and modern expositors of the Greek word *ἐπιουσιον*, which is peculiar to the New Testament, and to the Lord's Prayer, it might suffice to say that the plain word, "daily," best expresses that view of its meaning, in which all seem to agree. But if any will insist upon the idea of "coming," or "coming on," as involved in the etymology of that Greek word, yet its grammatical form attaches that idea rather to the bread, than to the day; thus: "Give us to-day"—or, "this day," "which," the new translator says, "is equally correct our coming bread." And what is this, but our daily bread; our bread for "the ensuing day;" that is, according to our family prayer, the day upon which we have entered; the passing day? And what, then, could be better than the plain old version, "Give us, this day, our daily bread?"

Is it possible that the new translator had seen, and yet misread the Latin note in the eighth edition of Tischendorf's New Testament, according to the Sinaitic manuscript? It is in these words: "The Latin called this bread daily, (*quotidianum*) which the Greeks called coming, (*advenientem*;) as the Greeks say, *τὴν ἐπιουσίαν ἡμέραν*, the coming day; (*advenientem diem*)." This does not, by any means, imply that the Greek use of the phrase, *ἐπιουσίαν ἡμέραν*, made the adjective *ἐπιουσιον*, in the Lord's Prayer, to denote the coming day. Yet the "coming bread," asked for as "daily bread," in the use of this prayer at night, might be bread for the day following.

Whether the clause: "And remit to us our debts, as we also have remitted to our debtors," is good English or not, may be rather a

question of taste than of grammar. But what matters it that Liddell and Scott's Lexicon does not render the Greek verb, *αφηνει*, by the English, *forgive*, while that Greek verb is used where our Lord says: "Thy sins be forgiven thee," and where His opposers said: "Who can forgive sins, but God only?" and in other similar connections. The word *remit*, of a strictly Latin form, may be a "more literal" rendering of the Greek *αφηνει*, than is the English *forgive*. But since all these words are compounds of similar formation, as well as essentially alike in meaning, the literal difference between any two of them is really that "twixt tweedledum and tweedledee." As to the English words, *forgive* and *remit*, the translator says: "The meaning is not essentially different." Then why propose a change? So, too, when he asks: "What ever induced any one to translate the word, *οφειληματα*, trespasses?"—the most natural and fitting answer is: What ever induced any one to object to that translation, as it is used in our Prayer Book?

But this new translator of the Lord's Prayer presents a more serious point of controversy, when he says: "Note the beautiful force here of the perfect tense, *have remitted*." This comment is founded on a peculiar reading in what this translator calls "the original Greek of the Sinaitic manuscript;" a reading sustained by a very small minority of other manuscripts, of whatever age. It might, indeed, be well asked here: What makes the Sinaitic manuscript "the original Greek" of the New Testament? The most forward admirers and advocates of that manuscript do not claim for it a higher antiquity than the fourth century. How, then, can a manuscript, which is, at the best, a copy of the New Testament, made after the lapse of two hundred years from the death of St. John, be safely pronounced the original Greek? Why may not some later manuscripts, which contain different readings in many places, be safely regarded as, at least, equally accurate copies of still earlier ones? Can all such later manuscripts be justly set aside as wilful perversions of that one, so arbitrarily assumed to be correct above all others? These are but glimpses of numberless questions involved in the deep and difficult subject of ancient manuscripts, which so many now incline to regard as wholly cleared up by the discovery of the Sinaitic copy. But that subject, which, in its present aspects, many volumes would not exhaust, cannot be discussed in a few lines.

It is more important to note here the queer mistake of the new translator, who calls the reading, *αφηκαμεν*, of the Sinaitic manuscript, "the perfect tense," when it is, in fact, the aorist tense, wholly distinct from the perfect, and by no means to be confounded with that; being, in some of its uses, more akin to the present, by which it is often best rendered in English. For as the aorist imperative commonly expresses that which is to be done or suffered at once, and the aorist subjunctive often describes a present contingency, of an event to be accomplished at once, and not progressively, so the aorist indicative may also denote an act which is promptly performed at once, on an occasion, and have, essentially, in such a use, which is not uncommon, the present tense. In this view of this point, any Greek scholar can readily conjecture how a very diligent copyist might, without wilful conceit, or faulty carelessness, change the present, *αφιμεν*, the reading of the Received Text, to the second aorist form, *αφειμεν*; the same letters, with the slightest possible change in their order; and how another copyist could then, without any actual corruption of the text, write the first aorist form, *αφηκαμεν*, which means precisely the same as the second aorist. And this is a fair sample of the conjectures which make up at least nine-tenths of the material with which experts in Biblical criticism exaggerate such unavoidable changes of letters and words, which they commonly call "errors that have crept into the text." It is not, therefore, to be expected that any diligent commentators, or competent committees of revision, will adopt the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript, the aorist *αφηκαμεν*, though supported by plain applications, and apparently direct citations of Scripture, in the works of ancient writers. But the strange mistake of the new translator, in calling it "the perfect tense," will justify a further discussion of the true use of the aorist in the Greek Testament, and the true method of translating it, which is conspicuous on every page of the Authorized Version, and almost marvellous, notwithstanding the oft repeated assertion of some advocates of revision, that the translators of 1611 did not distinguish between the aorist and the present tenses. Such discussion will also tend to show yet more forcibly the utter impossibility of a strictly "literal translation" of ancient Greek into English.



Since the English language, except in a few verbs, has no form answering to the aorist participles, active and middle, of the Greek, these must be generally translated by the simple past of the indicative mood, or by the pluperfect, with a connecting word, a conjunction or an adverb, or both. And in this way the aorist participle, active and middle, is commonly, and most precisely rendered in the Authorized Version. To translate the aorist participle of any Greek verb by the perfect participle active, of the English, is to change the meaning of the Greek writer, or at least to lose the true shade of his meaning. There are, in the New Testament, and in other Greek writings, some sentences, in which, for the sake of the best idiom, the perfect tense of the Greek may be rendered by the simple past of the English; and some, on the other hand, in which the Greek aorist may be not improperly translated by the English perfect. But such instances are rare. And if they were frequent, it would still be a grand mistake to confound the aorist indicative with the perfect indicative, in form as well as in sense, as the new translator of the Lord's Prayer does in the word *αφηκαμεν*.

As to the aorist participle, mere learners of Greek may be excused for a while if they mistake the real meaning and force of that part of the Greek verb. For by a strange error in the preparation of text books, Greek grammars now in vogue, and very popular with teachers of schools, and professors in colleges, give the English perfect participle active, as the translation of the Greek aorist participle active; instead of rendering this by a circumlocution, as a form which has no equivalent among the participles of the English language. This is a practical error to which learners of Greek were less exposed, when they studied it through the Latin; which has neither an aorist nor a perfect participle active, except in its deponent verbs. And here appears most strikingly the admirable precision of the Authorized Version. The double defect of the Latin in its participles had left, in the Vulgate and other Latin versions, a very imperfect translation of the aorist participle, active and middle, of the Greek; rendered, in most places, by the present participle of the Latin. But though the translators of 1611 had at hand, in every active and neuter verb of the English language, a perfect as well as a present participle, they

did not regard either the one or the other as a proper rendering of the Greek aorist participle, active or middle. With an accuracy of scholarship, which some critics of these days fail to discern, or affect to despise, they generally translated that participle, with the utmost precision, by a neat circumlocution, and thus avoided that glaring inaccuracy of the Latin versions; an attempted translation of the Greek aorist participle active by a similar form in Latin, when the Latin had no such similar form. And in some points they manifested also a philological acumen, not common in these days, by their discriminating use of the idiomatic expressions, "am come," "is come," "was come," and the like; which are worthy to be preserved, in spite of the *dicta* of technical grammarians, who, in their constant pruning and paring of language, are too prone to multiply what they are pleased to call "obsolete words and phrases." Even the phrase "was ceased," (Acts xx. 1.) considered as a more distinct translation of the aorist than the simple past, *ceased*, or the pluperfect, *had ceased*, is not justly liable to criticism.

Such expressions are perfectly intelligible to all English-speaking people. Witness the phrase, "being come," in the Preface of our Office for Confirmation; an expression more grammatical, as well as more idiomatic and legitimate, than such newly invented and sadly popular phrases as these: "is being built," "was being burned," and others still more awkward. And as to foreigners, it is only reasonable that they should acquire a knowledge of the idioms, as well as the technical grammar of the English language, before they attempt to deal with it as critics. For while the English is at least as well adapted as any other language to become universal, it will never be tied down to the Procrustean system of any "Universal Grammar," either in Orthography or Etymology.

The expressions, "am come," "is come," and "was come," in the Authorized Version, generally answer to the aorist indicative or aorist participle of the verb *ερχομαι*, *I come*; in some instances to the perfect, and more rarely to the pluperfect. Sometimes they are used to translate the present tense of the verb *ἔρχομαι*, *I come*; and, at least in single instances, the aorist of the verbs *αφινεομαι*, *I come*; *καταβαίνω*, *I come down*, and *γίνομαι* and *παργίνομαι*, which signify *to come to pass*. For in Greek, as in English, the

mere name of a tense does not settle its meaning in every place. In many English verbs, the simple past, as for example, *I thought*, differs very slightly, in sense, from the progressive imperfect, *I was thinking*. And in the best Attic Greek, Xenophon, (*Anab.* L. i., c. 8, 9, and L. ii., c. 6,) uses the imperfect and the aorist of the verb ἀποθνήσκω, and also of τελευτάω, interchangeably. The phrases which he thus makes synonymous are "he was dying," and "he died." And in many English verbs these forms would be entirely synonymous. Hence, the convenience—not to say necessity—which the translators of 1611 so acutely discerned, of a form of the verb *come*, distinct alike from the simple past, *I came*, the present, *I come*, and the perfect, *I have come*. And such a form they had at hand, in the good old idiom, "I am come;" an idiom as legitimate in English as the phrase, "I have cold" for "I am cold," in the French, or the "Ich bin gekommen," of the German.

Thus, then, the most striking characteristics of the Authorized Version, the exact, and very neat rendering of the aorist participle, active and middle, generally by the simple past or the pluperfect, with a connecting word, rarely by the perfect participle and still more rarely by the present participle, and the precise and careful rendering of all the parts of the Greek verb, generally by the best idioms of the English language, afford the highest proof of the entire independence and thorough scholarship of the translators of that incomparable version. And it is certainly high time for those who are wont to disparage them and their really wonderful work, to have done with the baseless idea, that they were largely dependent upon the Latin Vulgate for their renderings. It will be well, if those who are now exercising themselves in an attempt to revise the English Bible, prove equally independent of "Luther's Bible," or the Vulgate and other versions, in whatever language.

But is it possible that a revision of the English Bible, at this time, would set aside such good old idioms as "am come," "is come," and the like, and introduce such new inventions as "is being built," "was being considered," and others, which have even less show of necessity or convenience? If so, let the revisers translate the present passive, in the Greek, κατασκευάζεται, (Heb. iii. 4,) "is being built," and pause a little and imagine, if possible, the

meaning of the sentence, "Every house is being built by some man." Then let them candidly consider whether that one example of the present passive of a Greek verb does not wholly upset the notion of some grammarians of these days, that the present and imperfect tenses in Greek and Latin so exclusively denote continued or progressive, and incomplete action, as to be entirely distinguished from the simple present and past, or imperfect, of English verbs. For some, in a great excess of refinement on this point, have gone so far as to say that the ancient Greeks and Romans, in their famous languages, could not say simply, *I love*; but only, *I am loving*; as if the present tense of those languages were not equivalent to both of these English forms, and to be rendered by the one or the other, according to the context. But all the admitted influence of the context, in the true translation of single words, would not suffice to give the rendering of the English perfect to the aorist ἀφηκαμεν, in the Sinaitic copy of the Lord's Prayer, even if that were the original reading.

There is, certainly, some reason for translating the last words of the last petition, "the Evil One." For the Greek phrase, τοῦ πονηροῦ, has this meaning in some very plain passages. But the view of those Greek words, by which this new translator explains that change, is another strange mistake. "Our translators," he says, "erroneously supposed these words to be neuter; and so translated them by the English neuter noun, *evil*," and then adds, "they are in reality masculine." This, now, is one of the thousand and one reckless flings at those learned and diligent men, by fledglings in Greek, who might well sit at the feet of those translators, and be satisfied with their watchful care. For the words τοῦ πονηροῦ, in that place, whether translated "*evil*," or "the Evil One," are neuter, and not masculine; the Evil One being the Evil Spirit; and the Greek word for spirit, πνεῦμα, is always neuter, and never takes a masculine adjective.

It is not easy to imagine why the new translator did not offer any comment to sustain this peculiar rendering; "and take us not into trial." For *take* is a very unusual rendering of the Greek, φερω, which means, primarily, *to bring*. And the word πειρασμός, which he translates *trial*, most frequently, in the New Testament, signifies *temptation*, in the usual sense of that word.

It appears, from what has been hinted in this discussion, as to the claims of the Sinaitic manuscript, that even with the help of the Vatican, it is not decisive against the doxology in the Lord's Prayer; nor against the word "Our," in the first clause, and the last petition, "Deliver us from evil," which it also omits in Luke. And here it is worth while to note, that the Latin Vulgate, which our translators are often idly charged with following almost slavishly, omits the doxology, in Matt. vi., as well as in Luke xi.; and in Luke has neither the word "Our" with "Father," nor the phrase, "which art in Heaven." But the doxology, in Matthew, is found in all the versions of the English Hexapla, except Wiclif's and the Rheims.

There is yet something to be taken up, in the remarks of the new translator on the word *ἀμαρτίας*, in Luke xi. 4, which he renders *sins*, instead of *debts*, or *trespasses*. Somewhat in the strain of that comparative philology, which indulges, without restraint, in etymologies, however fanciful, he says: "This word is derived directly from a verb signifying to *miss*, or fail in hitting the mark, especially in shooting an arrow or hurling the spear. Hence, *shortcomings* would be a more literal rendering, had not the word gradually drifted away into denoting positive evil acts; and hence it is usually translated *sins*." With this plain, true view of the drift of words from lower to higher and higher meanings, as they are successively applied to physical, social, moral and spiritual relations, it is certainly strange that the new translator did not perceive how the word *οφειλήματα* might rise, under the Gospel, from the sense of *debts* to that of *trespasses*. The old translators, of the sixteenth century, seem to have thus observed the drift of ancient Greek, from the classical period of the philosophers and orators of Athens, to the Alexandrian period, and the infusion of Hebrew senses, and so on to the Apostolical and Christian uses of Greek words, in their highest significations. And the greatest wonder is that they did not translate *οφειλήματα*, in the Lord's Prayer, by the word *trespasses*. For St. Matthew, giving Christ's own application of that very word, used *παραπτώματα*, (translated "trespasses") as the equivalent or synonym of *οφειλήματα*, which he thus made interchangeable, if not strictly synonymous with *ἀμαρτίας*, in its highest sense of *sins*. Accordingly, five o



the versions in the Hexapla, Wiclif's Tyndale's, Cranmer's, the Geneva and the Authorized—all except the Rheims—have "trespasses," for *παράπτωματα*, in that application of the prayer, recorded in immediate connection with it, in Matt. vi., 14, 15, as made by our Lord himself. Tyndale's version alone, (1534) the first after Wiclif's, renders *οφειλήματα*, in the Lord's Prayer, by the word "trespasses," which is found, however, in the Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, set forth in 1549, together with the clause, "them that trespass against us," instead of Tyndale's phrase, "our trespassers."

Many facts of this kind show how freely the translators of 1611 exercised their own judgment, with a rare combination of learning and discretion, both in the translation and upon the text. But this cursory view of some leading points in the true method of translating Greek into English, chiefly suggested by the glaring errors of one new version of the Lord's Prayer, sufficiently vindicates, as to the New Testament, the title page of the Authorized Version: "The Holy Bible, translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations, diligently compared and revised." And in view of what is now-a-days cried up, as some great progress in Biblical scholarship since the Authorized Version was made, it is fitting to add, that those who would hope to improve that version by new translations here and there, must be prepared, by diligent reading of Greek and Latin and English literature, in every department and period, and by a thorough collation of all the books of the Old Testament, in the Hebrew, to make their own Lexicons, each one for himself, or to correct those which they may have to consult, however new-made and bepraised.

N. E. CORNWALL

## LOST BOOKS OF THE BIBLE.

There is something of romance in the very word *Lost*. Mystery has lifted more insignificant things into fame than history has been able to do. The world never wearies of sweeping up dropped pennies to the neglect of bank accounts, and of gadding about after lost sheep to the detriment of thriving flocks in the home pastures. More telescopes are brought to bear upon Merope than upon the brighter six of the Pleiades. The records of modern science have no romance like that which attracts the antiquarian to the dust-stained pages of Pancirolli. The *ignotum* has always ranked as the *mirificum*. The universal Psyche is continually peering, or contriving to peer, into the darkness that veils the features of her Cupid.

Next to the El Dorado which we call the unattainable, lying yonder ahead of us in the future, in its desirableness, is the Lost that lies behind us in the past. What the Orient, Egypt, Greece, have left us that is deathless, awakens less interest and in many minds less hope than those lost arts which are vaguely shadowed forth in song, legend, and mouldering ruin. The telescopes of criticism and exploration seek to get the focus on a lost thought—the nebula of some misty hint that has strayed down to our times—more patiently than the unflickering light of antiquity's greatest thought.

All this comes of the romance that hangs around the Unknown. In this principle we see some explanation of the many toilsome years that scholarship has spent upon the lost literary treasures of the early world; and especially upon the missing books of that is, connected with the Bible. We propose to run over the list of these in series and somewhat in order, giving some account of each; although in respect to many of them a meagre mention is all that remains to us, and in some instances the mention is only

a reference. Of many the very titles have not escaped Time's effacing fingers. Those titles that have come down to us with greater or less degree of definiteness—often a mere reference—number nearly thirty. This includes only those that are mentioned or alluded to—either quoted or cited in some way—in the Sacred Record itself. To exhaust the literature of each and all of these—giving records, traditions, conjectures, and pseudographs, at large—would require an immense volume; a volume much larger than the Old and New Testaments together.

We begin with that one which lies furthest back in the years of the world; so far back indeed, that the voice of Chronology hesitates when she names the date.

## I.

So far as the Sacred Record goes, Enoch (B. C. 3382–3017) is the earliest of the revelators. The Pentateuchal narrative of him and his life is silent upon the matter of his authorship; and in the New Testament he is not mentioned as a writer, although the quotation from him there was probably made from some written record. This occurs in *The General Epistle of St. Jude*, 14 and 15: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these [false teachers] saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." This passage leaves no doubt as to which of the Enochs is meant—the son of Jared and the father of the longest-lived of all the patriarchs; he that "walked with God" and "was not for God took him;" he whose measure of days made a year of years. The Canon is silent as to his writings, but collateral tradition is not; and in this we catch vague glimpses of this great exemplar of human goodness. In the Haggadah of the Talmudic Midrash we hear much of him; and his greatness and his learning no less than his goodness are the constant themes of the writers therein. And beyond the Talmud we hear of his name and his praises. One tradition makes him the inventor of writing, arithmetic and as-

tronomy—a kind of Hebraic Kadmos or even a Hermes Trismegistos. Upon these views, see the *Præparatio Evangelica* (lib. ix. cap. 17) of Eusebius. One account mentions his *Revelations* as numbering *three hundred volumes*—unquestionably the most important mass of apocalyptic literature of the world, unless books were very small in those days. But in those three hundred and sixty-five years of his life the pen of a ready writer might easily have compassed it, one would think. Still probabilities are not worth anything as historical facts. Tradition further tells us that Enoch's literary remains were committed to his son and preserved in the family by Noah; and so came on down to later ages. The Koran (Chap. 19) refers to Enoch, doubtless, in what it says of Edris—the learned—where he is spoken of as “a just person and a prophet,” and one whom God “exalted to a high place.” An annotator on this passage of the Koran, quoting *Al Beidawi*, says that this Edris was Enoch, the great-grandfather of Noah, who had that surname—Edris—from his great knowledge, “for he was favoured with no less than thirty books of *Divine Revelations*, and was the first who wrote with a pen and studied the sciences of astronomy, etc.” The learned Bartolucci, however, in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, (Part 2) undertakes to prove from the testimonies of the ancient Jews that the Enoch who was surnamed Edris was an entirely different person from the Enoch who was translated by faith, and one that lived many ages later in the world's history. But we feel assured that the Enoch quoted by St. Jude and the Edris mentioned by Mahomet are one and the same person.

There are many who maintain that *The Book of Enoch* brought from Africa, in Ethiopic translation from a Greek version, by James Bruce in 1773, is the translation from a Hebrew MS. of great antiquity; and there are some it seems who believe that it is the veritable lost work of the venerable antediluvian himself. It is certainly entitled to great respect as an ancient and remarkable writing, and a discussion of its merits in that regard belongs to those learned in oriental palæography. It is, however, impossible to conceive that it covers the same ground as the Lost, whether we judge that ground by tradition or by rational probability. In any event we cannot make three hundred volumes of

it, nor even thirty ; and, if we leap over the infinite improbability of its being the same, it is still patent that there are 299, or at least 29, volumes or books of the so-called works of Enoch yet missing ; and consequently to be classed among the Lost Books of the Bible.

It may be worth mentioning here that in the *Chronographia* of the Greek historian Georgios, the Syncellus of Constantinople, (about A. D. 800) considerable fragments quoted from the books of Enoch are to be found ; but it seems to be rather unlikely that the source quoted from by this writer was the same as that used by St. Jude, given above.

The account which Swedenborg gives of this Book of Enoch is curious and interesting. The word *Enoch* he defines as signifying to *instruct* ; and Enoch the patriarch he holds to represent the Seventh Church or seventh period of human history. Then began the transition from the Most Ancient Church, beginning in Adam, to the Ancient Church which dates from Noah. The former of these churches covered that period or stage of human history in which man held communion directly with the angel-world and derived thence all his knowledge of truth which came to him by perception ; that is, he reached his knowledge of truth only through his love of good ; and his speech both with the angel and his fellow man was not a speech of words, but was effected by expressions of the face and lips. Inspiration was direct to each individual and was universal. The latter of these churches—the Ancient Church—on the contrary, covered that period of human history in which man, having lost the power of direct communication with the spirit-world by perception, had a written Word from which he must seek knowledge of the true and the good through his intellect. That word or Bible was written in pure correspondences, and is known as the Ancient Word.

Now, Enoch represents the transition point at which the Most Ancient Church began to change to the Ancient Church. There were persons in that time who met the growing wants of the age by putting into doctrines the truths—or, more strictly speaking, the knowledges of the good and of the true—which had theretofore been received directly as individual inspirations ; the purpose of which doctrines was to enable the fallen and the falling man



to reach the necessary knowledges by means of his intellect, which was the only means left to him. The need of a written Word may be illustrated by comparison with geometry. Conceding the tradition of the lost Kaballah of the Egyptians, we may clearly see how that loss has created our need for text-books in geometry. While the Kaballah, with its pregnant principles, gave the whole science of geometry at a glance to the happy possessor of that Key of the Universe, the student of to-day must proceed towards a knowledge of the science through the inductive process formed into mathematical doctrines by Euclid and others. It was so in those old Enoch days. The Kaballah of Jehovah was gliding from man's possession; and the text-book—the Ancient Word—became necessary. The persons who wrote for that purpose were called Enoch; and it seems to follow that a part of that Ancient Word has been known as *The Book of Enoch*. Bearing upon this matter the Seer of the New Church gives the following explanation of what is usually known as the Translation of Enoch, as related in Genesis, v. 24, and referred to in Hebrews, xi. 5: Men of the Most Ancient Church had walked with *Jehovah*, which means “to live the life of *love* ;” but those of this period—that is to say, those embraced in the term Enoch—walked with *God*, which means “to teach and live according to the doctrine of *faith*.” Enoch’s walking with God, accordingly, means his living by faith in contradistinction to living by love; and the statement, that “he was not, for God took him,” means that the doctrine in question was preserved for the use of posterity. The Ancient Word, Swedenborg holds, was superseded by the Word or Bible which we now have; but that parts of it at least survive “among the people who live in Great Tartary.” That Ancient Word treated of events as late as the sons of Noah; and of course, therefore, embraced more than the *Book* or *Books of Enoch*.

## II.

The first of the Lost Books directly mentioned in the Sacred Record itself is *The Book of the Wars of Jehovah*, of which we have in Numbers xxi. 14 and 15, what seems to be part of the contents, in these words: “What he did in the Red Sea, and in

the brooks of Arnon, and at the stream of the brooks that goeth down to the dwelling of Ar, and lieth upon the border of Moab." The subject of this sentence may be either Moses or Jehovah, and probability, as following from the narrative in which it is found, suggests the former; although *The Speaker's Commentary* takes the other view, making *he* in the sentence mean the Lord. The same learned authority holds that the words quoted "are a reference rather than a quotation." There seems, notwithstanding this opinion, to be good reason to consider the words neither a quotation nor a mere reference, but the introductory contents of a chapter in the lost work, such as introduces many ancient writings; as, "The words of Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah," which open *The Book of Nehemiah*; "The proverbs of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel," introducing *Proverbs*; and "The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, etc.," introducing and announcing *Isaiah*.

The author, the exact nature, the scope, and the fate of this *Wars of Jehovah*, are all left, so far as the Bible goes, unrecorded, save as they may be inferable from this one sentence. Notwithstanding this silence there are strong reasons for believing that large portions of the historical part of the Bible have been extracted from that more Ancient Word.

In noticing the next in our list of Lost Books we shall give the account that Swedenborg gives in his *True Christian Religion*, and elsewhere, of this work, in connection with that, for the reason that the two books form one in his treatment of them.

### III.

The Pentateuchal historian, in the course of the account given of the warlike exploits of the Israelites, in the same 21st chapter of *Numbers*, mentions and quotes a work entitled, as there translated, *PROVERBS*. Others prefer the translation *ENUNCIATIONS*. In four verses—27 to 30—we have these words: "Wherefore they that speak in *Proverbs* say, Come into Heshbon, let the city of Sihon be built and prepared: for there is a fire gone out of Heshbon, a flame from the city of Sihon: it hath consumed Ar of Moab, and the Lords of the high places of Arnon. Woe to

thee, Moab ! thou art undone, O people of Chemosh : he hath given his sons that escaped, and his daughters, into captivity unto Sihon, king of the Amorites. We have shot at them ; Heshbon is perished even unto Dibon, and we have laid them waste even unto Nophah, which reacheth unto Medeba."

This book has only this one mention and quotation to give us any idea of the whole work. No clue beyond this is given to the name of the author or authors, to the size and scope, to the date, or to the exact character of the book. As in the case of the *Wars of Jehovah* the extracts from it in the Sacred Record may be numerous and extended, but if so, they are unacknowledged.

The account of this work and the preceding one given by Swedenborg is curious. He states that before our present Bible was written the world had an earlier revelation suited to its state and character—a more Ancient Word ; that, for reasons which he gives, the present one was put in place of the older ; and that that more Ancient Word was divided into parts, of which two are mentioned together—the historicals and the propheticals. The former of these was entitled *The Wars of Jehovah*, and the latter the *Enunciations*. With reference to the former, he translates the mention and accompanying quotation, reference, contents, or whatever it may be, in the xxi. chapter of *Numbers*, thus : "Therefore it is said in *The Book of the Wars of Jehovah*, I walked into Suph (the sea), and the rivers of Arnon, and the channel of the rivers, which turned aside where Ar is inhabited, and stopped at the border of Moab." With reference to the latter book, he translates from the same chapter of *Numbers* quoted above : "Therefore the Enunciators say, Go into Heshbon ; the city of Sihon shall be built and strengthened ; for a fire went out of Heshbon, and a flame out of the city of Sihon ; it hath devoured Ar of Moab, the possessors of the heights of Arnon. Wo to thee, O Moab ; thou hast perished, O people of Chemosh ; he hath given his sons fugitives, and his daughters into captivity to Sihon, king of the Amorite. We have despatched them with weapons. Heshbon hath perished even to Dibon, and we have laid waste even to Nophah, which is even to Medebah." Swedenborg further explains that the more Ancient Word and our Bible contain alike the first chapters of *Genesis*, which treat of the

creation, of Adam and Eve, of the Garden of Eden, of the sons and posterity of Adam till the flood, and of Noah and his sons. That more Ancient Word, he says, is still preserved in Asia, among the people who live in Great Tartary." This matter is given in full by the Seer of the New Church in sections 265 and 279 of his *True Christian Religion*. Further mention and discussion of these two works may be found in *The Arcana Celestia*, sections 2686, 2897, and 8273; in *Conjugal Love*, section 77; and in *Apocalypse Revealed*, section 11.

## IV.

Of all the lost literature of that *juventus mundi* none has excited half the interest, comment, and discussion, that THE BOOK OF JASHAR has. Perhaps not all the others together have excited half as much. This interest has arisen from a variety of causes, chief among which is the scope for conjecture found in the words of the title, in its ambiguous phraseology, and in the general mist that hangs over it. The obscurity, while it baffles, excites inquest; and thus commentary, theory, restoration, forgery, and fiction, have raised this *Book of Jashar* into, by all odds, the greatest of the Lost Books of the Bible.

It is twice mentioned in the Old Testament. The first time is in the history of the celebrated battle of Makkedah, rendered famous by the part had in it by the sun upon Gibeon and the moon in Ajalon. After narrating the series of engagements in behalf of the Gibeonites, between the Israelitish army under Joshua and the five confederated kings of the mountain-dwelling Amorites, the historian—*Joshua*, x. 12 and 13—says of the last engagement: "Then spake Joshua to the Lord, in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon: and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in *The Book of Jasher*?" This mention of Jashar is omitted from the Septuagint translation. This reference to the work indicates that its contents were, in part at least, historical. The second mention shows that the scope of the lost book may have been broader than

simple details of events. It is to be found in the first chapter of the second book of *Samuel*, and in these words, beginning at the 17th verse:

"And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his son. (Also he bade them teach the children of Judah the Bow: behold it is written in *The Book of Jasher*.) The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places: how are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph. Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no dew, neither rain, upon you, nor fields of offerings: for there the shield of the mighty is vilely cast away, the shield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed with oil. From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty, the bow of Jonathan turned not back, and the sword of Saul returned not empty. Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided: they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions. Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul, who clothed you in scarlet, with delights, who put ornaments of gold upon your apparel. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! O Jonathan, slain in thine high places. I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women. How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished."

This is a beautiful poem in its natural sense; but in its correspondent meaning it must be rated with the finest of the divine lyrics of Scripture. *The Bow* was unquestionably the title of the poem, and the production itself is what David bade the musicians to teach the children of Judah.

The word *Jashar* is an adjective, and means *upright, just*, or, by derivation as some hold, *valiant*; and, by what an eminent scholar calls "a small orthographical contrivance," it may be changed both in Hebrew and Syriac into *song*. So the title of the work in question is variously rendered. The Talmudic writers give as great variety as the Gentile critics do. That magazine of infinitely varied *midrashim* has a large number of strange suggestions largely conjectural written by its many contributors. And so it has been in all ages, and in many languages; commentators, critics, scholiasts, readers, and rabbins, have had their say; each one adding a something to the confusion in the beginning which has increased at times arithmetically and at times geometrically.

The Rabbi Rashi, commenting on the second mention of *Jashar*—the one in *Joshua*—speaks of *Genesis* as the Book of the Upright Ones—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; whence probably comes the theory that *Jashar* and *Genesis* are one. Others, as



the Rabbi Eliezer, though upon slightly different grounds, infer that it means *Deuteronomy*. Others again, as the Rabbi Samuel ben-Nachman, think that it means *Judges*. Jerome mentions that *Genesis* was also called the Book of the Just—*Liber Justorum*. The Rabbi ben-Gershom notices the theory of Rashi; but takes issue with it, he believing that *Jashar* was a separate work, and that it was lost and probably destroyed in the captivity—or in one of the captivities; and in this opinion other eminent scholars, and indeed we may say the weight of scholarship, agree; among others, Junius, Hottinger, and later orientalists. The author of *Quæstiones Hebraicæ*—whether Jérôme or not, there seems to be great doubt—holds that *Jashar* and the two books of *Samuel* are the same, the ground being like the one that identifies it with *Genesis*, that is, that these two books contain a history of the Upright Ones—Samuel, Gad, and Nathan. Sextus Senensis quotes the opinion of some nameless author who held that *Jashar* was *The Book of Eternal Predestination*, whatever that is. The Septuagint translates it a book of the just (singular); and the Vulgate calls it the *Liber Justorum*. The Targum—Aramaic version—gives it as *The Book of the Law*, which the Rabbis Kimchi and Abarbanel adopt, and which might mean Exodus, Deuteronomy, Leviticus, the Pentateuch, the Old Testament at any one period, or in fact almost anything. The Arabic version, like the Received English, escapes the trouble by rendering it the book of *Ashee*. The Syriac does not agree with itself, in one place rendering it *The Book of Praises*, or of *Hymns*, which may mean *Hymns of Praise* or *Sacred Eulogies* or *Threnodies*; and in the other place giving it simply as *Ashir*. And so on with the others, till there seems to be no end of it. Philologically considered, the variety and uncertainty are too near infinite.

From the quotation in *SAMUEL* some have conjectured that *Jashar* was a sort of anthology or collection of poems on heroic, religious, personal, and miscellaneous subjects. The passage quoted is unmistakably rhythmical in its structure; and largely upon this ground, Sanctius, in his commentary on 2. *Kings*, ventures the conjecture that *Jashar* was a book of sacred songs, from which probably *The Book of Psalms* was compiled. Bishop

Lowth takes a somewhat larger view of the scope of the *Lost Book*. He imagines that the collection of songs was national, embracing all kind of songs; and that the name may be a derivative from the probable opening words—*Azyashir, then sang*; as begins the Song of Moses in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus. This view he derived, as did Herder, in some degree from the Syriac versions. The conjecture of Gesenius is akin to this—that the work was a sort of Hebrew anthology, which took its name from the character of the men celebrated in the poems. Dr. Henry holds that the book was a collection of state poems. This view, like that of Bishop Lowth, suggests the remark that *state* or *national* and *sacred*, among a people whose government was theocratic, would probably cover about the same scope when applied to poems.

Abichat quotes Masius, who held that *Jashar* was a collection of annals, or one of a set or series of annals, kept in ancient times, in which were written by learned men whatever was thought worthy of recording; and that it was named *Jashar* “from the trustworthiness and method of the arrangement, or because it related the deeds of the Israelites, who were elsewhere spoken of under the symbolized name of Jeshurun,”—the beloved. Fürst accepts this hypothesis; and long before his day Theodoret considered *Joshua* a compilation from *Jashar*. Colovius (1612–1686) believes that *Jashar* was a set of heroic annals embodying the songs, such as that quoted in 2. Samuel, the body of the work being narrative.

Ilgen, whose theory Gesenius mentions to dissent from it, held that *Jashar* means *valiant*; and that the book—like the *Hamasa* of the Arabs—celebrates the achievements of warriors. A similar view is held by Dupin, (1657–1719) who interprets “the use of the bow” to mean that the work was military in its character. In explanation of this idea we may mention the fact that a similar derivative meaning is to be found in the Latin word *virtus*, which, derived from *vir*, a *man*, meant originally manhood or manliness; but afterwards—naturally in a people who regarded manliness as the first of virtues—came to mean *virtue*. But one must remember that the Hebrew idea of virtue was so utterly different from the Roman that the translation from *just* to *valiant*, or the reverse, is, to say the least of it, violently improbable.

Montanus seems to be the post-Talmudic father of the rather vague theory that the contents of *Jashar* were political and moral precepts; *political* having very little meaning in such a connection from the character of Hebrew politics.

If any one wishes to see that most pitiaibly feeble of all the theories—that *Jashar* was a manual of archery!—thoroughly disposed of, although it needs disposing of least of all, he may find it either in Dr. Adam Clarke's *Commentary* on these two texts, or in the first volume of Horne's *Introduction*.

The Rev. T. M. Hopkins takes a new departure in this field of conjecture, by the heroic process of rejecting as spurious both texts that refer to and mention *Jashar*. The only point he makes that seems worthy of notice is the fact, cited above, that one of the mentions in the Hebrew Scriptures is not to be found in the Septuagint translation. Those caring to see his argument may find it in the *Biblical Repository* for 1845, beginning at page 97.

Through such a mist of authorities, hypotheses, theories, views, conjectures, and vain imaginings generally,—tinged as it is with national pride or prejudice here, and with the bias and warp of great learning there, and shaded by masterly ignorance everywhere—through such a mist, it is no easy matter for the eye of Common Sense to fix the outline of this shadowy ghost of old *Jashar* that beckons at us across the chasm of so many centuries. Viewed apart from all the disturbing influences of national feeling and the madness of much learning, it seems highly probable that *The Book of Jashar* was a book of the more ancient Word that the world had in its early days; a book prophetic in its character, containing narratives and poems; a book Divine in its origin, and written in the correspondential language which distinguishes THE BIBLE of to-day, and which lifts it out of the chaos of its mere natural sense into the light of Divine Truth—consistent, beautiful, perfect; a book superseded and laid aside by its Author to give place, in whole or in part, to a Word better suited to the latter world. Since the alleged discoveries of *The Book of Enoch* by Bruce in Abyssinia, of *The Ascension of Isaiah* by Bishop Laurence in regions equally remote, and of *The Epistle of Barnabas* of late times in some monkish closet, we need not be over incredulous about the possible existence of

*Jashar* somewhere in Asia. Exploration is the passion, if not the mania, of our day. Mr. George Smith reports the discovery of records that are to give us a native Babylonian account of the deluge, with Assyrian chronicles that bristle with chronology, going back 432,000 years. M. Golubieff tells us of DeKhanikoff's discovery of a whole Samarkand library of parchments, palimpsest and primary, that rival—that surpass—the best results of Maio and Tischendorf. Layard has disturbed the stones of Nineveh not in vain. Botta exposes to view an Assyrian palace at Khorsabad; and Beke, who ploughed the same soil afterwards, turned his exploring eyes and instruments towards Sinai. Di Cesnola has dug up grim old dateless kings and gods from the grave-dust of Idalium. Wood is invading the sanctities of the virgin Artemis at Ephesus. Des Vergers is interviewing Etruscan knights, whose bones have been dust and whose swords have been rust for centuries. Mariette on the Nile to-day is exhuming, dusting, and reading scrolls, papyri, winding-sheets, and tablets, that would have made Champollion's head ache, and are enough to fill Seyfarth's heart with both admiration and envy. And Schliermann, having drawn aside the curtain from Helenë's fragrant boudoir and exhibited to us the crown jewels of the long line of Dardanian kings, is about to open the century-covered gates of Mycenæ. And, yet again, Herr Rohlf's is unrolling mummies in the Libyan oasis of Dachel, and Ernst Curtius has just given to the world knowledge of the centuries-buried treasures of Olympia.

So we need not be surprised at any time to hear of the recovery of not only *Jashar*, which can hardly claim an antiquity of more than 3,500 years, but also of *Enoch*, which may be 5,100 years old, or even some annals of Mariette's Prince Ra-Hotep, who flourished some 6,300 years ago; and, after all—as we dig deeper and deeper into the strata of buried empires—why not look for some of Mr. George Smith's Assyrian chronicles, dating back somewhere towards the year 432,000 B. C.?

We return to JASHAR.

Six *Books of Jashar* are known to be in existence—separate works, different from one another in their origin and contents; varying widely in their characters and claims to authenticity, and not one of them all having the shadow of a claim to be *the* work

in question. Let us glance at these in the order of their publication.

1. In 1586, *The Book of Jashar* appeared in Hebrew at Cracow; a Rabbinical work, accredited to Jacob ben-Meir, also known as Tham of Rameru. Rabbi Jacob was the most distinguished of the three sons of the learned Rabbi Rashi, mentioned above. The work is a treatise on ritual or legal questions, in the form of a Talmudical commentary. No translation has been made. A sort of recast of it appeared at Vienna in 1811.

2. In 1625 at Venice, in 1628 at Cracow, and in 1668 at Prague, appeared a *Book of Jashar*, anonymous. One of the most thoroughly informed Hebrew scholars of recent times—the late Emanuel Deutsch—pronounces it “written in correct and even elegant Hebrew.” It is historical and embraces a history of events from the creation to the time of the Judges. It contains the Song of Joshua; but, singularly enough, does not contain the Song of David, quoted from 2d Samuel. It expands many of the Pentateuchal narratives; but gives the Makkedah miracle of the arrested sun and moon in nearly the words of the Bible; specifying, however, the length of time the sun stood still as “thirty-six times,” or hours. A Preface gives us the marvellous history of the manuscript. It was found—such is the story—by one Sidrus, a Roman officer, at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in the year 70. Sidrus, seeking plunder, found an old man, who had taken refuge in a cunningly-contrived secret cell, having in his possession a vessel containing the Hebrew books of the law, the prophets, and other hagiographical works, including this *Jashar*. The officer took the sage under his protection; removed him and his manuscript treasures to Sevilla in Spain, and there built a house wherein the treasures were deposited and the sage snugly supported during his life. The narrative from this point hurries to its close. From Sevilla, in the course of time, the *Jashar* was taken to Naples, where it was printed.

Such is the story—a rather clumsy fiction, which gained credence for a long time, and gave the book great popularity. The *Jashar* had the misfortune of being known by three titles; and when, in 1674, it was translated into Judeo-German, a fourth



title—*Perfect and Right*—was given to it. All this created great confusion in the critical world, as one may readily imagine. But criticism finally brought light into this darkness and confusion; and it was made clear that this famous book was only a clever forgery—an ingenious compilation, principally from the Talmud, but also from various other Midrash annals, Pseudo-Josephus, Jewish legend and Arabic myth—by a Spanish Jew of the thirteenth century. An Arabic word here and there, such as Abdallah, Ali, Mohammed, Emir, and Khalif, conclusively proved its Mediæval composition or compilation, at least in part.

But after all this had been made plain enough to European scholars, this compilation, as late as 1840, was translated into English and published in stereotype edition, in New York, by M. M. Noah and A. S. Gould, who took the trouble to publish with it certificates of its fidelity to the original from certain eminent Hebraists who had examined it. The enterprise reflects slender credit upon the publishers, and seems to have had meagre results even financially.

3. About 1736 a third *Book of Jashar* appeared. This one was ethical in its character, consisting of eighteen chapters which treat of such topics as the creation, worship, faith, repentance, abstinence, prayer, death, and the future life. It was blunderingly confounded in the minds of many in those days, with the preceding work. It is now pretty generally admitted to have been the work of Zechariah the Greek, and was written some time before the close of the fourteenth century.

4. In 1751 appeared in London a quarto bearing the title of *The Book of JASHAR, with Testimonies and Notes explanatory of the Text; to which is prefixed various readings: translated into English from the Hebrew by Alcuin of Britain, who went a Pilgrimage into the Holy Land*. This had been secretly printed at Bristol by one Jacob Ilive, a type-founder and printer, who was the real author. The introductory Preface, purporting to be written by Alcuin, (A. D. 725-804), gives a history full of circumstantial details concerning both himself and the manuscript of *Jashar*—how he had learned in the University of Oxford (founded A. D. 886), “all those languages which the people of the East

speak ;" how, accompanied by Thomas of Malmesbury and John of Huntingdon, he journeyed to Gazna in Persia ; how they three found the long lost *Book of Jashar*, purchased the privilege of translation, and spent a year and a-half in that work ; how, after seven years' absence, they returned to Bristol, having their translation ; and how he, fearing to let his manuscript fall "into the hands of the stationer," and thus "incur the displeasure of the purple," kept it until he grew aged and infirm, and then "left it among other papers to a clergyman in Yorkshire."

So much for the Alcuin letter of explanation. The editor explains in a dedication that he bought the manuscript translation at an auction in the north of England ; and gravely assures the reader that Wycliffe (1324-1384) had written on the outside of it this testimony : "I have read the book of *Jashar* twice over, and I much approve of it as a piece of great antiquity and curiosity ; but I cannot assent that it should be made a part of the canon of Scripture."

The book itself, which contains thirty-seven chapters, is a tissue of hair-brained vagaries, referring to and quoting the works of Hur—who rests for his authority on *The Book of Aron*—Phinehas, Othniel, Jazer, Jezer, Zadok, Tobias and others. Notes, testimonies, and various readings, glosses, and the like, are given and quoted freely and confidently.

Such was the Alcuin-Wycliffe-Ilive *Book of Jashar*, which had its day of popularity and favour ; and that too in the face of a prompt exposure in *The Monthly Review* for December, 1751—the year of publication. That it was an absurd tissue of fabrications or heterogeneous extracts, was fully shown. That journal pronounced it "a palpable piece of contrivance, intended to impose upon the credulous and ignorant, to sap the credit of the books of Moses, and to blacken the character of Moses himself." In explanation of its material the *Review* says : "It appears to have been constructed in part from the apocryphal writings of the Rabbins ; in part from a cento of various scraps stolen from the Pentateuch ; and in the remainder from the crazy imaginings of the author (Ilive)."

It is very clear that Alcuin never left Europe at any time ; that Gazna was not in Persia ; that the University of Oxford was not

founded until at least eighty, probably one hundred and fifty, years, after Alcuin's death, A. D. 804; that stationers were not in existence in his day; that paper, upon which he spoke of writing, was not manufactured at all until three hundred years after that time; and that Alcuin wrote Latin and spoke an Anglo-Saxon—or an Anglo-Latin—that was about as much like the English of this Preface and translation of *Jashar* as is Homer's *Iliad*.

In addition to all this, it soon transpired upon well-authenticated evidence that Ilive had written the trash as well as printed it; and to crown all, Ilive's assistant and co-worker in the composition made a clean breast of it by confessing the facts. This man detailed the expedients used by them to avoid discovery, stating among other things that "the forms were worked off in the night time in a private press-room, after the men of the printing-house had left their work."

After, and in spite of such thorough exposure of the fraud, this *Book of Jashar* was reprinted in Bristol in 1827 and published in London two years later in quarto as a new discovery. This old-new publication was heralded to the world with the announcement in prospectus that nearly a thousand of the most literary characters, prelates, dignitaries, and public establishments had subscribed to it. Neither mention of, nor allusion to, the Alcuin-Wycliffe-Ilive affair appeared in this new issue. The new editor, seeing the absurdity of Alcuin's translating into English, claims that this is a translation from the Anglo-Saxon into which the book had been first rendered; and, to crown the matchless audacity of the imposture, the editor—in this edition nameless—refers to Alcuin's published works, wherein he is stated to have mentioned this translation, whereas Alcuin of course never mentioned anything of the kind.

A second edition of this reprint was announced; and in that prospectus the editor styles himself the Rev. C. R. Bond.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> So famous is this literary forgery that careful statements of it in detail have been thought necessary. One of these may be found in the Dublin *Christian Examiner* for 1831; and Horne gives an elaborate refutation of it—and elaborate is his style—in the fourth volume of his celebrated *Introduction to the critical Study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*.

5. In 1854 at Berlin, and in 1860, at London, appeared Dr. J. W. Donaldson's scholarly production entitled *Jashar, Fragmenta Archetypa Carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti Textu passim tessellata*, in octavo.

This is a proposed reconstruction of the lost work, not a discovery; and is entitled to respect as an earnest philological suggestion. Dr. Donaldson's theory is that "whatever ancient fragments of the sacred books of the Hebrews exhibit the nature of uprightness, celebrate the victories of the true Israelites, predict their prosperity, or promise future blessedness, have a claim to be considered among the relics of the book of *Jashar*." His *fragmenta* are arranged into seven groups; and his grouping—or, rather, re-grouping—produces some singular results. It makes Shem, Ham and Japheth the sons not of Noah, who is Israel under a figure, but of Adam; and, as a consequence, the events relating to the Patriarch of the Deluge, given in *Genesis* ix. 18–27, are transferred to Adam. Cain and Abel are made the sons of Shem; Abraham becomes a son of Abel; and Esau is transformed into Lamech, the son of Methuselah. From all of which one is ready to conclude that it took quite as wise a son to know his own father in those patriarchal times as it does in these degenerate days.

That is, Dr. Donaldson undertakes not only to tell us but also to show us what *Jashar* was; and he does this by putting together the *disjecta membra* of it, which he finds scattered here and there in the Old Testament. His opinion is that the original compiler of the lost *Jashar* was Nathan, the sage adviser of David and the tutor of Solomon, assisted probably by Gad the Seer.

Although much ingenious learning and great memory are shown in this evolution of *Jashar*, it commands a very limited number of believers. Men say of the restorer as Festus said to Paul—his brain was turned by too much learning.

6. In 1394, *The Book of Jashar*, a Rabbinical work, was written by Rabbi Shabbatai Carmuz Levita. This is an ethical treatise and has never been either translated or published. A copy of the manuscript is in the Vatican Library.

This closes the long list of Pseudo-Jashars.

Swedenborg's statements concerning this greatest of the lost books form part of its history. He informs us that *The Book of*

*Jashar* was one of the books of the ancient Word mentioned above. He thus renders the two references to it—first, from the first chapter of 2 *Samuel*: “David lamented over Saul and over Jonathan, and wrote to teach the sons of Judah the bow; see what is written in *Jasher* ;” and, second, from the tenth chapter of *Joshua*: “Joshua said, Sun, rest in Gibeon, and, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon; is not this written in the Book of *Jasher* ?” This book, he informs us, as well as the two preceding, is still in existence, preserved, as a part of the ancient Word, “among the people who live in Great Tartary.” His full discussion of this matter—the Lost Books—may be found in sections 264, 265, 266 and 279 of his *True Christian Religion*, one of his latest works.

## V.

The Sacred Record is brief in its mention of *The Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite*; although there are numerous references to the prophet himself and his utterances, to be found here and there in the histories, as in 1. *Kings* xi., 29, and xiv., 2. The one direct mention of the book is in 2. *Chronicles*, ix., 29, where we are told that “the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last,” are to be found in three works there named—*The Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite*, and the separate books of Nathan the Prophet, and of Iddo the Seer.

## VI.

There appear to be two works of Samuel the Seer numbered among the lost ones.

The first of these is cited in 1. *Chronicles*, xxix., 29, as containing part of “the acts of David the King, first and last,” and is there called merely *The Book of Samuel the Seer*. The rest of the chronicles in question are said to be in the works of Nathan the Prophet and of Gad the Seer. These three works, it is there stated, contained a full history of the Psalmist-King “with all his reign and his might and the times that went over him, and over Israel, and over all the kingdoms of the countries”—a pretty comprehensive chronicle, it seems.



## VII.

The second work of Samuel is spoken of in 1. *Samuel*, x. 25, in the following apparently informal way: "And Samuel told the people The Manner of the Kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord." This, we may surmise, was a kind of record of the political system of the author's people, including doubtless the political economy of the Israelitish government; although the civil polity of that government appears to have been at no time very complex.

## VIII.

The lost writings of Nathan the Prophet also appear to be two. Although the subjects of these—the acts of David and those of Solomon—are similar in character, and might be embraced in one work, still the connection in which they are cited suggests that they are probably treated in separate books.

The biography of David with the history of his reign is said—1. *Chronicles* xxix., 29—to be complete in three works, namely, *The Book of Nathan the Prophet*, the writings of Samuel and of Gad the Seer. This may mean that that subject was complete and separate in that trilogy. The nature of the work in question may be inferred from the material extracted from it in the Biblical narrative of David.

## IX.

The second reference to the writings of Nathan the Prophet is in 2. *Chronicles*, ix. 29; and there they, along with the works of Ahijah the Shilonite and of Iddo the Seer, are cited as containing "the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last." Here it is possible, though by no means necessary, to suppose that there was a historical hiatus in these annals—if they were annals—of Nathan. The stronger presumption, however, is that the hiatus is covered by a quotation just preceding the statement. Assuming a hiatus, we have no reasonable alternative from the conclusion that Nathan wrote two books; and that in the passage just cited *The Book of Nathan the Prophet*, which contained mater-

ials for a biography of Solomon, was separate from the one just mentioned on David.

### X.

In a passage already cited—1. Chronicles, ix. 29—direct mention is made of the writings of Gad, David's Seer. It is there called simply *The Book of Gad the Seer*; and is given as one of the three sources of information upon the life and times of David the King, the other two authorities being Samuel the Seer and Nathan the Prophet. The work was probably apocalyptic. Compare *The Chronicles of King David* below—xxiii.

### XI.

We are told in 1. *Kings*, xi. 41, that certain additional facts—"the rest of the acts"—in the life and times of Solomon, are written in *The Book of the Acts of Solomon*; but the Sacred Record leaves us slender means of determining whether this is the collective writings of Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo, cited in 2. *Chronicles*, ix. 29, or a separate and different chronicle.

### XII.

It is evident that Solomon produced at least three times as many proverbs as are given in the canonical book under that title. The presumption is strong that these were all reduced to writing. There must therefore be a lost *Book of the Proverbs of Solomon*, possibly in more than one volume. In the eulogy on Solomon in the fourth chapter of *Kings*, he is pronounced superior in wisdom and understanding to the wise ones of the East country and of Egypt; that is, of all the world. He is wiser than Ethan the Ezrahite, than Haman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and the world revered all these for their vast stores of both interior and exterior knowledge. To convey an idea of the extent of his "wisdom and understanding exceeding much," the author tells us—1. *Kings*, iv. 32—that he "spake three thousand proverbs." The *Proverbs* of our Scriptures contain less than one thousand.

## XIII.

*The Songs of Solomon* also is lost. Of this work we have information in 1. *Kings*, iv. 32, where, speaking of the great Proverb-Poet of Israel, the sacred author says: "And his songs were a thousand and five." The information here is so specific that one cannot well escape the conclusion that the writer must have had some written record to speak from. A great many poems might have been called, in round numbers, after the Oriental way, a thousand songs; but to say a thousand and five seems to indicate a historical fact. From the specimen of Solomon's songs that we have, it is fair to infer that his poems were full of character, and not very brief lyrics at that; and the reflection that so many of them have been lost is full of regret.

## XIV.

In connection with the facts stated in regard to the proverbs and poetical works of Israel's royal *Laureatus*, already referred to, we read in 1. *Kings*, iv. 33, that he lectured on botany, zoölogy, ornithology, herpetology, and ichthyology. The language of the Record is: "He spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." The royal lecturer had immense audiences of foreigners as well as of natives; for people came, so the narrative runs, "to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all Kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom;" and his reputation was general, for "his fame was in all nations round about." There may have been—it would be in no small degree risky to say there probably was—a written course of *Lectures on Natural History*, or at least a *Syllabus* of such a work. There can be little doubt, however, that extensive notes were taken by some of those many scholars who went "from all Kings of the earth" to Jerusalem to hear those learned lectures. As to the nature of these teachings, there is a strong presumption that Solomon's instruction consisted very little in giving the facts of natural history to be found in our text books upon these subjects—the genera, species, habits, and

physical laws generally, of the fauna and flora—but mainly, if not exclusively, in explaining the spiritual meanings of these things. Such was the wisdom and understanding of the times. Spiritual truths stood first and natural truths were important only as they illustrated and taught the spiritual. All teaching pointed upward; and the wise in zoölogy strove to make clear the dark sayings of the seers. The father of Solomon had said: “Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean.” The son made clear the higher meaning by showing that *hyssop* means *truth*; and the Psalmist’s prayer meant: “Cleanse me with truth.” Light would be needed to make clear the utterances that were to fall in the coming years from the lips of the revelators. Jeremiah was thereafter to write words like these: “The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, Give thy daughter to my son to wife; and there passed by a wild beast that was in Lebanon, and trode down the thistle;” and again: “Mine heritage is unto me as a lion in the forest. \* \* \* Mine heritage is unto me a speckled bird, and birds round about are against her. \* \* They have sown wheat but shall reap thorns;” and Ezekiel was coming to say: “Ye shall be filled at my table with horses and chariots, and with all men of war, saith the Lord God;” and the whole Hebrew Scriptures were teeming and to teem with correspondential truths—facts in nature that mean truths in higher and purer senses—and the spiritual meanings of the natural phraseology needed a key. Teachings like those of Solomon doubtless gave such key; so that the reader of revelation might be enabled to look, as in no other way we can, “Through nature up to nature’s God.” Doubtless those inner meanings of natural things were even as early as Solomon’s day beginning to become obscure, and public instruction was becoming necessary.

Such, we venture to suggest, were the character and aim of the teachings of the royal proverb-poet’s lectures before aggregated audiences of Jews and Gentiles, that attracted so much attention over the then (1000 B. C.) civilized world. That they have not come down to our day seems to be a matter of great regret; but, without knowing as much as Omniscience does of the facts in all their relations to the universe, it is entirely unsafe to be positive in criticising the event.

## XV.

Iddo, or Jedai the Seer or Prophet—or the Iddos, if there were two of them—may be mentioned as the author or authors of probably three missing books.

The first of these has been mentioned (V. and XI.) above. We find it cited in 2 *Chronicles*, ix. 29, among the authorities for the history of Solomon as *The Visions of Iddo the Seer*; and the visions are described as being “against Jeroboam, the son of Nebat.” The concurrent authorities there cited are Nathan and Ahijah. It is possible that the three separately-mentioned writings are parts of a general work which Iddo himself seems—2 *Chronicles*, xiii. 22—to have called *Midrash*—commentary, exposition, or exegesis. Still, it seems best to mention them separately. Josephus, in his *Antiquities* (viii. 9, 1), says that this writer was the prophet who was slain for disobedience, by a lion, as narrated in the thirteenth chapter of 1 *Kings*. Jerome, in his commentary on 2 *Chronicles*, xv. 1, identifies Iddo with Oded, the father of Azariah.

## XVI.

The second of the works of Iddo the Seer, is mentioned in 2 *Chronicles*, xii. 15, and is there called the *Book Concerning Genealogies*; and is cited as one of two records of the acts of Rehoboam, first and last, the other being the Book of Shemaiah, the Prophet. The identity of this seer with the Iddo, who wrote of Solomon (XV. above) has been called in question by Bertheau—upon 2 *Chronicles*, ix. 29—and by Ewald in his *Israel-Geschichte*; and if the authors are two, the separateness of the books follows. The word *genealogies* appears here and elsewhere to mean a census or enumeration. Compare 1 *Chronicles*, ix. 1.

## XVII.

In reference to the third volume under the name of Iddo, there is much greater difficulty. In 2 *Chronicles*, xiii. 22, we are told that the rest of the acts of Ahijah and his ways and sayings—his complete biography, that is to say,—are written in *The Story*—



*Midrash*—of the Prophet Iddo. It appears that this Prophet Iddo, together with or assisted by Seraiah, kept the public chronicles or rolls during the reigns of Rehoboam and Abijah (990–970). This may have been included, along with the others even, among the *midrashim* of this author. There is, it is true, some show of reason in the title for believing that this book and the preceding one were contained in the same work; but their oneness would be perhaps as difficult to prove as their separateness.

## XVIII.

It seems probable, at least something more than conjectural, that a missing, or at least only partly preserved, record is cited in 1 *Kings*, xiv. 29, where we are told that a complete history of Rehoboam is to be found written in the *Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah*. No author is named. There seems to be no great violence to probability in assuming that the same record is referred to in 1 *Chronicles*, ix. 1, where the writer speaks of the “Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah,” and in 2 *Chronicles*, xxxii. 32, where the writer speaks of the “Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel.” The varied phraseology here indicates not exact titles nor reference; and the presumption seems to be that there were two separate works, one on the kings of Judah and the other on the kings of Israel. Separate governments seem to call for such a division or separateness of the annals.

## XIX.

A complete *Life of Uzziah*, we are told in 2 *Chronicles*, xxvi. 22, was written by Isaiah the Prophet, the son of Amoz; and this is probably a different work—at least the manner of reference to it seems to indicate that it is so—from that on the kings of Judah mentioned above. It is evident, in fact, from 2 *Chronicles*, xxxii. 32, that this is so; although some very learned scholars think that this and the next—both prophetic monographies by Isaiah—were parts of, or embodied in, the annals of Judah and Israel. This opinion, however, seems to be distinctly contradicted by the passage just cited, wherein we are advised that the acts of Hezekiah are written in *The Vision of Isaiah*

the *Prophet* and in *The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel*. The translators, it is true, insert the *and*, but they doubt less had their reasons for so doing.

## XX.

Different also from the work on the kings of Judah, because both works are mentioned together, must be *The Vision* of Isaiah the Prophet, cited in 2 *Chronicles*, xxxii. 32, already referred to as containing further details than those given there relative to the exploits, and especially the good deeds, of Hezekiah the King.

## XXI.

*The Sayings of the Seers*, cited in 2 *Chronicles*, xxxiii. 19, contained the prayer of Manasseh—"how God was entreated of him, and all his sins, and his trespass, and the places wherein he built high places, and set up groves and graven images, before he was humbled." The Hebrew text here has *Hozai* or *Chozai*—*seer*; and the marginal reading is *the seers*. Gesenius, Fürst, and some others, make it a proper name—Hosai; and, if that view is correct, the title should be *The Sayings of Hosai*.

## XXII.

Similar to *The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah*, in both its probabilities and conjectural uncertainties, is *The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel*. The same collateral citations—1 *Chronicles*, ix. 1 and 2 *Chronicles*, xxxii. 32—with their flexibility of phraseology bear upon this work as they do upon that. *The Book of the Kings of Israel*—mentioned in 2 *Chronicles*, xxxiii. 18, as containing the rest of the acts of Manasseh, his prayer, and the prophetic utterances made to him—seems to be the same.

## XXIII.

Bearing upon the life of David there appears to have been *Chronicles of King David*, mentioned in 1 *Chronicles*, xxvii. 24. It is by no means certain, although it is the usual explanation, that this is the same as *The Book of Gad the Seer*, given above, in X.

## XXIV.

In 2 *Chronicles*, xii. 15, we are told that there was a *Book of Shemaiah the Prophet*, in which, together with the work on the census by Iddo already, (in XVI.), mentioned, there were written the acts of Rehoboam (B. C. 1031-973), first and last.

## XXV.

At the close of the Biblical account of the reign of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, (B. C. 914-889) we are advised—2 *Chronicles*, xx. 34—that further details, that is the rest of the acts of that potentate, first and last, are written in *The Book of Jehu* the son of Hanani.

## XXVI.

A compilation entitled *The Lamentations* is mentioned in 2 *Chronicles*, xxxv. 25, which was made up of the elegies and funeral songs for Josiah the King (B. C. 639-608), composed by Jeremiah and “all the singing men and the singing women,” and which was made an ordinance in Israel.

## XXVII.

In the New Testament the number of missing works might possibly be made considerable; but we shall confine our attention to the two apparently most important. St. Paul in his *Epistle to the Colossians*, iv. 16, directs that church to cause that epistle to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and also that they should read the epistle from Laodicea. There are two theories in explanation of this direction. The first is that the one referred to as from Laodicea was the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, either as an encyclical letter or as originally addressed to the Laodiceans. The other theory, which has all the probabilities in its favour, is that there was an *Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Laodiceans*, which is now lost or at least missing. Dr. Lange suggests that St. Paul probably wrote the two epistles—to the Colossians and to the Laodiceans—at the same time, and sent them together by Tychicus, mentioned in verse 7, whom he charged with detailed

instructions, which the apostle only refers to in a general way here in the writing. It may be worthy of passing mention that the Canon of Muratori cites an *Epistle to the Laodiceans*.

XXVIII.

There seems little room for doubt of the fact that many venerable men, and some of them of weight as authorities, held that *The Epistle of Barnabas* was entitled to a place in the canon. Tischendorf's discoveries in 1844 and 1859 gave new impulse to discussion on this point; but all such discussion is alien to the purpose of this paper; and we accordingly pass it by. In the Sinaitic Codex, discovered by that learned and indefatigable explorer at the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, which contained both the Old and the New Testaments, was included this *Epistle of Barnabas*. Its claim to being lost depends accordingly upon the degree of authenticity—or rather the probabilities in favour of its authenticity—resting upon its inclusion in that Codex.

JAS. WOOD DAVIDSON.

## THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER

### AND OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS.

A few years ago some business called me to a neighboring state, and I there met an old, intimate and valued friend, who, having married an accomplished lady of the Roman Church, had strayed from the church of his Fathers and become a convert to Rome. In the course of one of our conversations he remarked, that he would give me the reasons which induced him to become a Romanist. I listened to him with great attention, and after he was entirely through his argument, I replied, I would state a few facts which would prevent me from ever becoming one. I thought he appeared somewhat astonished at several of my statements, and I presume he at once sought information upon the matters discussed, as on the same day he brought me the present of a book from his distinguished Bishop, who is, indeed, a man of power and ability, and who now stands amongst the foremost champions of his Church. This book is entitled, "The Primacy," and was written by that excellent prelate, the late Francis Patrick Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, who, in my early youth, was one of my preceptors.

A few days after this, I was invited by some friends to call with them upon the Bishop, and after an interchange of the usual salutations and courtesies observed upon such occasions, ecclesiastical subjects were introduced by one of the party, and a long discussion ensued between the Bishop and myself, he maintaining the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, whilst I, an humble layman, maintained the opposite opinion. This discussion intensified my interest in a matter which now attracts the attention of the whole Christian world, and as I have bestowed much thought upon the subject, I propose now to give the result



of my investigations; premising, that I have little respect for misty and contradictory traditions, and therefore shall confine myself principally to facts stated in the Bible, that great and inspired work, which is received by all Christians as the word of God.

In the first place, then, let us examine if any Primacy of authority is given in the Scriptures to St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles.

In the Gospel according to St. Matthew, we find our Saviour speaking alike to all of His Apostles, just chosen, giving them power to heal the sick, to cleanse the lepers, to raise the dead, to cast out devils,<sup>1</sup> telling them whatsoever they should bind on earth should be bound in heaven, and whatsoever they should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven.<sup>2</sup> After His resurrection, he commands them all to go and make disciples of all nations, baptising them, and teaching them to observe all things he had commanded the Apostles,<sup>3</sup> and St. John says that He breathed on them, telling them to receive the Holy Ghost, and saying unto them, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained."<sup>4</sup>

What greater power, we would ask, was given to St. Peter than was here given to them all? St. Peter was, indeed, prominent among the Apostles, and until St. Paul appeared he was generally their spokesman; but although he and St. John and St. James stood forth more prominently before the world than the others of the first Apostles, yet they had all received the same commission from their Divine Master. St. Peter was conspicuous and first among his equals, as Clay or Webster or Calhoun were first among American Senators, or as Pitt or Burke or Gladstone in the English Parliament. Yet though Calhoun or Clay or Webster, or Pitt or Burke or Gladstone may have been the giant intellects of their day, still in the American Senate or the British Parliament they met their fellow-members as their equals; and although they may have been looked up to by them, for advice, or counsel, or leadership, this did not give them any power of author-

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. x.

<sup>2</sup> xviii. 18.

<sup>3</sup> xxviii. 18-20.

<sup>4</sup> St. John xx. 21-23.

ity over them ; officially, they met as equals, and when it came to the final settlement of any question, and the final decision was given, the vote of the one was as potent as the vote of the other.

We think all candid men will concede that the passages above quoted from the Holy Scriptures clearly show that our Saviour gave like commissions to all of the Apostles, and from these same Evangelists we find that He did not give one Apostle authority over another. Fortunately the Scriptures are not like monkish traditions, they can always be relied on.

Upon several occasions the Apostles disputed among themselves who should be greatest, but such ambition was discountenanced by our blessed Saviour. St. Mark tells us that when our Saviour had come to Capernaum and was in the house, He asked His disciples what they had been disputing about on the way. But they held their peace, for they had been disputing among themselves who should be greatest. It would almost seem that they were ashamed to answer His question ; and it was then that Jesus said unto them, "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all and servant of all."<sup>1</sup>

If St. Peter were to become the infallible head of the Church, the other disciples seem to have been strangely ignorant of it, and nowhere in Holy Scriptures can we find that our Saviour appointed St. Peter to be His Vice-gerent upon earth after His crucifixion.

Before we leave this branch of our subject we would refer our readers to the 17th chapter of St. John. Our Saviour's hour of suffering and crucifixion was close at hand, and He prays for His disciples ; not for St. Peter alone, but for all alike.

In this beautiful and touching prayer St. Peter is not preferred above the others, but praying for them all, our Saviour says of them all, "As Thou hast sent Me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." Surely here the same commission was given to them all alike. St. Peter was indeed prominent, because of his zeal and fearlessness, but the same powers which were given to him, to teach, to forgive and retain sins, were given

---

<sup>1</sup> St. Mark ix. 33-37.

to the other Apostles. Their commissions were the same. St. Peter was a distinguished Apostle, but he was twice reproved by our Lord. Upon one memorable occasion he was mistaken, sadly mistaken, and overrated his own strength, and then at least he was not infallible. I refer to his denial of his Lord.

When our Saviour arose from the dead, He did not appear first to St. Peter or any of the Apostles, but St. Mark informs us (xvi. 9) that he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven devils. And St. Peter is not excepted when Christ upbraided all the Disciples for their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not at once in the resurrection.

In the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 8, verse 14, we find the following:

"Now when the Apostles which were in Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John."

Men who are sent are generally regarded as the agents or ambassadors of those who send them. Kings and Emperors and Presidents send their agents, they are not sent by them. We are sure all men would be surprised if they read a document in which it was stated that the Emperor of Russia, or Queen Victoria, or the President were sent by their subalterns upon any mission. Inferiors do not send Superiors, and if St. Peter had been recognized as the supreme and infallible head of the Church, the Vicegerent of Christ upon earth, the Apostles would surely have said at least, that St. Peter was requested to go, but no such phraseology is used, but a term of authority. "They sent unto them Peter and John."

We next call attention to the proceedings of the Council of Jerusalem, as recorded in the 15th chapter of Acts; it settles beyond dispute, the whole question of any supremacy as claimed or exercised by St. Peter.

When Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch there arose a question about circumcision, and Paul and Barnabas and others were sent up to Jerusalem to consult, whom? Peter alone? No! The Apostles alone? No! but the Apostles and Elders. They came on this mission to Jerusalem, and it was the Apostles and Elders who came together to consider of this matter.

Let any candid man read this 15th chapter, and we think he must give it the same construction that we do. When there arose that controversy in Antioch about circumcision, concerning which there was so much interest manifested, if St. Peter had been recognized as Pope, the supreme and infallible Bishop, the Vice-gerent of Christ upon earth, the people of Antioch would most naturally have said to Barnabas and Paul, "Go to Jerusalem and consult Peter the Pope, for he is infallible, and is of course the true judge in all controverted questions." But if St. Peter were then the Pope and the infallible head of the Church, St. Paul and St. Barnabas and St. James, and the Apostles and Elders and brethren all seem to have been most profoundly ignorant of it, and surely we would suppose that if he had been the infallible Pope they would have been the first of all men to have known it. It seems to have been utterly unknown to them, for the Apostles and Elders actually met in council, as if they had some right to settle the matter in dispute.

So far from leaving this whole matter to St. Peter, and praying him to decide the question before them, the Bible says after there had been much disputing Peter rose up and spoke, and after him Barnabas and Paul, and after they had spoken, James, who is generally acknowledged to have been Bishop of Jerusalem, reviews the question, and in words of authority says, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God."

The Apostles and Elders and brethren all seem to have taken part in this council, for when the question before it was decided, we read—

Then pleased it the Apostles and elders and the whole Church to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, and they wrote letters by them after this manner: The Apostles and Elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps no such scene as this will ever occur at Rome in the Vatican. There the voice of one man is potent over all. What

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts xv. 22-23.

must candid and enlightened Romanists think when they calmly peruse and ponder over this 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, which is said to have been written by St. Luke himself.

We will next examine the Epistles of St. Paul, in which we shall find ample and abundant proof in support of what we have above written. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 3, verse 11, we find the following :

“For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.”

Here we see St. Paul declares Christ the foundation, and that other foundation can no man lay. We now pass to the second Epistle to the Corinthians, in which we find that St. Paul did not regard himself as inferior to any of the Apostles.

For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles.<sup>1</sup>

In the same chapter, in comparing himself with others, he speaks as follows :

Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more; in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. \* \* \* Beside those things which are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.<sup>2</sup>

Continuing in the same strain in the next chapter, He writes as follows :

I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me. for I ought to have been commended of you : for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest Apostles, though I be nothing.

Truly the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders and mighty deeds.

For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong.<sup>3</sup>

Surely if St. Peter had been Pope, the infallible and Supreme Pontiff, above all others; St. Paul divinely inspired as he was would have known it; and yet in the epistle above quoted we find him saying in nothing was he behind the very chiefest of the

<sup>1</sup> 2. Cor. xi., 5.

<sup>2</sup> 2. Cor. xi., 22-28.

<sup>3</sup> 2. Cor. xii., 11-13.



Apostles, and asking in what the Church of Corinth was inferior to other Churches. It would seem from this, that St. Paul was not inferior to any Apostle, and that the Church at Corinth was not inferior to that of Rome or any other.

We now pass to St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians:

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ unto another Gospel.

Which is not another, but there be some that trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ.

But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

But when it pleased God who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace,

To reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood.

Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me, but I went unto Arabia, and returned again to Damascus.

Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.

But other of the Apostles saw I none save James the Lord's brother.<sup>1</sup>

We quote from this chapter to show that St. Paul required and sought instruction from no man. He says that the Gospel which he preached was not received by him of man, neither was he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, and that though he or an angel should preach any other Gospel than that which he had preached unto them, "Let him be accursed."

Next we ask the reader to peruse the second chapter of this Epistle from verses first to fourteenth, inclusive.

These words record most important and telling events. Three years after St. Paul's conversion he went to Jerusalem to see St. Peter and abode with him fifteen days. Fourteen years afterwards he went again to Jerusalem, and finds St. Peter still there. Church affairs were discussed, and when James and Cephas and John perceived the grace that was given to Paul, they gave him and Bar-

---

<sup>1</sup> Gal. i. 6-19.

nabas the right hands of fellowship; and what was it they agreed should be done; was it that St. Peter should go to Rome? No; it was determined that Paul and Barnabas should go to the heathen, and James and Cephas and John to the circumcision. Does it not seem passing strange that after the lapse of so many years, St. Peter could have been Bishop of Rome, and yet we can find it stated nowhere in the Bible that he had ever been there, and that seventeen years after St. Paul's conversion we find James and Cephas and John going to those of the circumcision, and Paul and Barnabas among the heathen.

What, however, is still more surprising, St. Paul goes on to say, that when Peter was come to Antioch he withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed. And why did he withstand him to the face, and why was he to be blamed? It was because Peter had eaten with the Gentiles, but when certain persons came from James, he withdrew himself, fearing those of the circumcision.

St. Paul says other Jews dissembled with him, insomuch that Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. It was for this he withstood him to the face; it was for this he was to be blamed. St. Paul appears to have acted as if he thought he had as clear judgment upon matters of doctrine as St. Peter, but surely he could hardly have thus acted, if he had known that St. Peter was his superior, and the infallible head of the Church.

In none of his Epistles written from Rome, though he mentions many names of those who were or had been with him, does St. Paul speak of St. Peter as having been there, nor does he in any way refer to him as having authority in Rome, or claiming any supremacy over the other Apostles, whether at Rome or elsewhere.

As we said before, we have little regard for misty and contradictory traditions; we have therefore been careful to quote from the Bible, to give chapter and verse that our readers might judge for themselves; and we now affirm that the Bible nowhere says that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, or was ever in Rome. No Roman clergyman can truthfully deny this.

If St. Peter had been Pope of Rome, does it not seem wonderfully strange that St. Paul never mentions the fact, although St. Paul remained there, and labored there, so gloriously and so long?

If St. Peter had been at Rome, would St. Paul have said of those he mentioned, "These only are my fellow-laborers;" would he have said, "only Luke is with me;" and could he have said that at his first answer no man stood with him, that all forsook him, but that God stood with him and strengthened him; that the preaching might be fully known, that the Gentiles might hear, and that he was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. We think if St. Peter had been there, he would have stood by St. Paul in his sorest afflictions.

St. Paul appears to have been the great Christian light at Rome. It would seem that God had specially set him aside for this work, for when he was in great danger in Jerusalem, and had been before the council, we find in chapter xxiii., verse 11th, of the Acts of the Apostles, that the Lord stood by him and said, "Be of good cheer Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome."

God sent St. Paul as a great light to the Gentiles; he commanded him to testify of Him in Rome; and braving every danger, the great Apostle went there to fulfil his great mission. In his letter to the Philippians,<sup>1</sup> he says:

But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me, have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the Gospel.

So that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace and in all other places.

And many of the brethren in the Lord waxing confident by my bonds are much more bold to speak the word without fear.

St. James, in his beautiful epistle, does not mention St. Peter, but styles himself, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." St. Peter wrote two epistles, but in neither claims to be Bishop of Rome, or the infallible head of the Church. He commences by saying, "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ." In his first epistle, (v. 1), he says, "The elders among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed." He commences his second epistle by saying, "Simon Peter, a servant and an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like

---

<sup>1</sup> Phil. i. 12-14.

precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." St. Peter, in these epistles, speaks of himself as an Apostle and an Elder, but claims no supremacy, or infallibility, and does not style himself Supreme Bishop or Bishop of Rome. The first epistle was written from Babylon, and as the Scriptures nowhere say that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome or in Rome, the Romanists are hard pressed upon this point, and they claim that Babylon meant Rome. Such a thing is almost too absurd for argument. St. Peter, in his first Epistle, (v. 13), says: "The Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you salueth you, and so doth Marcus my son." It was as easy to write the word Rome as Babylon; it is a shorter word, with fewer letters in it, and yet some cunning priests would have us believe that St. Peter meant Rome, although he wrote Babylon.

St. John wrote three epistles, but in neither of them does he mention St. Peter or the Pope of Rome. In his first epistle (ii. 1.) he writes as follows:

My little children, these things write I unto you that ye sin not, and if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.

In his third epistle (verses 9th and 10th) we have the following:

I wrote unto the Church, but Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.

Wherefore if I come I will remember his deeds, which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church.

It would seem from the above, that St. John did not think much of those who love to have pre-eminence in the Church.

St. Jude has written one epistle, and styles himself, "Jude the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James," but makes no mention of St. Peter.

In the book of the Revelation St. Peter is not spoken of.

We now ask if it is not wonderful and passing strange that St. Peter could have been the Supreme Pontiff, the Pope or Bishop of Rome, and yet that none of the holy writers in the Bible speak of it. That such a thing could have happened is almost beyond credulity itself.

Many Romanists point to a single chapter in the Bible to prove

almost everything they claim in relation to the supremacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. We allude to what took place when our Saviour said to His disciples, "Whom say the people that I am?" This conversation is recorded by St. Luke and St. Mark, and more fully by St. Matthew.<sup>1</sup>

It will be observed that in the record, both of St. Luke and St. Mark, it is merely said that when our Saviour asked of His disciples, "Whom say men that I am?" and they answered that some said that he was John the Baptist, and some Elias, etc., our Saviour then asked them, "But whom do ye say that I am?" And when Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ of God," our Saviour merely charged them to tell no man. It seems to us that if these two Evangelists had understood our Saviour to say that the Church was built upon Peter, they would not have failed to have stated so important a fact, but they intimate nothing of the kind.

In St. Matthew, when Peter had answered the question, Jesus said unto him :

Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The reader will remark that when Peter said, Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God, our Saviour replied that flesh and blood had not revealed it to him, but His Father in heaven ; and was it not upon this rock, this rock of faith, this fact that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God, that the Church was to be built ?

No Romanist, we presume, will dispute the authority of a Pope, and especially the authority of a great Pope, and the Rev. John W. Burgon, in his work entitled *Rome and England*, pages two hundred and ten and eleven, says, that Gregory the Great, who was Bishop of Rome from A. D. 590 to A. D. 604, explains that, in his opinion, Christ is the "rock" spoken of in St. Matthew, chapter 16th, verse 18th. Mr. Burgon goes on to say :

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi 13-20; Mark, viii. 27-30; Luke, ix. 18-21.



Such passages coming from such a quarter are decisive of the question at issue, for how could Gregory, Bishop of Rome, be ignorant of the traditional interpretation of the words which concerned his See so nearly, if any such traditional interpretation existed.

We will add, if Gregory the Great was infallible, and the Romanists declare that all Popes are, they cannot dissent from his opinion on this matter. They must remember that they have acknowledged his infallibility.

Whilst discussing this subject let us not forget what St. Paul says in the first epistle to the Corinthians, iii. 11 :

For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid; which is Jesus Christ.

Now suppose for argument's sake that the Romanists give the right construction to the passages of Scripture which we have quoted from Matthew, Mark and Luke, still this would not prove that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, or that he ever was in Rome. He may have casually made a visit to the Imperial city, but of this we have no account whatever in Scripture. If we take the Bible as our sole authority upon this point, we should infer he never was in Rome, and when we peruse the writings of St. Paul and others, it appears incredible, and contrary to all human experience, that St. Peter could have been Bishop or Pope of Rome, as the Romanists assert, for more than twenty-five years, and yet that none of his brother Apostles, or the other writers in the Bible, ever speak of him as having been there, or as having exercised the functions of a Bishop in that See.

St. Luke is said to have written the Acts of the Apostles, and was in Rome with St. Paul, but he makes no mention whatever of St. Peter's ever having been there. We have quoted so copiously from the Bible upon this subject, that we pass from this point, and leave it for the consideration of our readers.

Our Saviour, before his Crucifixion, said to all His Apostles, that whatever they loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven, and whatever they bound on earth should be bound in heaven. After His Crucifixion he appeared in their midst and said to them, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained;" and after His Resurrection we find, according to St. Mark, (xvi. 15) He said unto

them, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature;" and we find in St. John, (xx. 4) "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you; as My Father hath sent Me, even so I send you." What greater commission could He have given to them all than that contained in these words.

We have seen that St. Paul has said, that he supposed he was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles; we have seen him withstanding Peter to the face because he was to be blamed; we have seen him saying to the Corinthians, For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I was not burdensome unto you, and we hear him saying in words of authority, though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that we have preached, let him be accursed; yet still after all these acts and sayings, strange to say, some men will assert that he was under the authority of St. Peter.

We have seen a council of the Church assembled at Jerusalem, where the Apostles and elders met to decide upon a question of doctrine, where it would appear St. James was the president or presiding officer, where after much disputing St. Peter, St. Barnabas, St. Paul and St. James all spoke; a council where they met as equals, and yet some men would have us believe that we have a Pope who has greater authority than St. Peter or St. Paul ever claimed, whose dicta from the Vatican are to be received as the supreme law of the Church of Christ.

The first General Council of the Church, after the days of the Apostles, was held at Nicæa, A. D. 325. The Pope was not there, though represented by two Presbyter Legates. That council did not acknowledge either the supremacy of authority, or infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. Neither did that of Constantinople, which met A. D. 381; nor that of Ephesus, which met in 431; nor that of Chalcedon, which met in 451. It took the Romanists many centuries to find out that the voice of the Pope was the voice of the whole Christian Church.

In the work of the Rev. Mr. Burgon, entitled *Rome and England*, to which we have before referred, at page 205 and following, we find a letter from Pope Gregory the Great, to the Emperor Mauricius, from which it appears that John, Archbishop of Con-

stantinople, assumed the title of Universal Bishop. We give the following extract from the address of Pope Gregory :

Who is this, who contrary to the precepts of the Gospel, contrary to the canons, presumes to usurp and assume this new title? \* \* \* If any one in that Church arrogates to himself that name, the whole Church will fall to pieces (God forbid!) when he falls who is called Universal. Far be that name of blasphemy, however, from all Christian hearts, whereby the honour of all other priests suffers diminution, while it is senselessly arrogated to himself by one.

It was out of honour truly for St. Peter, chief of the Apostles, that by the venerable Council of Chalcedon the said title was offered to the Roman Pontiff.<sup>1</sup> But never did any one of my predecessors consent to use this title of singularity, lest while a private title is bestowed upon one priest, all the rest should be deprived of the honour which is their due.

Comment upon this is unnecessary.

We also call attention to the well known fact that Pope Honorius was condemned by the 6th General Council, held A. D. 680. The late Roman Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore, in his work entitled the Primacy, page 177 and following, says :

The Fathers of this assembly on reading among other documents, the answer of Honorius to Sergius, Bishop of Constantinople, rejected it with execration, together with the letter of Sergius to which it replied, and another letter directed to Cyrus, then Bishop of Phasis; and added to their anathemas against various heretics by name, this very solemn condemnation: "We have resolved also to anathematize Honorius, who was Pope of ancient Rome, since we find from a letter addressed by him to Sergius, that conforming to his views in all things, he confirmed the impious dogmas." They cried out: "To Honorius the heretic anathema."<sup>2</sup>

Here we find, according to the testimony of a learned Roman Archbishop, writing in defence of Papal prerogatives, that a General Council of the Church, A.D., 680, pronounced a Pope a heretic, and yet but recently a Council of Roman Bishops at the Vatican in Rome, have proclaimed the Pope supreme and infallible Bishop. Surely, when two councils, both claimed to be genuine, and of authority by the Roman Church, so widely disagree, it is high time to consult the Holy Word of God upon the subject.

All men who are familiar with history well know that there were different men, who, at the same time, claimed to be the Pope.

---

<sup>1</sup> This was not the act of the Council, but of certain members from Alexandria. See Robertson's Church History, Book III., Chap. viii.

<sup>2</sup> See Robertson's History of the Christian Church, vol. ii., p. 438.

For seventy years the Popes were selected from the French, and resided at Avignon. Urban the 6th and Clement the 7th claimed the Papal chair at the same time, and whilst France, Castile and other countries acknowledged the authority of Clement, Germany, England and other countries adhered to Urban.

At one time no less than three might thus claim to be infallible Popes. John the 22nd was one of the contestants, and he summoned a General Council, which met and deposed him. Gregory refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Council, but resigned, and Benedict the 12th was deposed also. All this occurred in the early part of the 15th century, when Martin the 5th was elected to the Papal chair.

It would seem from this that at one time Roman Councils did not conceive that the authority of the Pope was equal to their own, but at last they have surrendered, and pronounce him infallible. To show what a revolution of opinion has occurred in this matter, we quote from Martin John Spalding, who once was Bishop of Louisville, and afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore. In his history of the Reformation, written in reply to the history of the Reformation by D'Aubigné, he uses the following language:

Besides we learn for the first time that the Roman Chancery decide on articles of faith. We had always thought that this was the exclusive province of General Councils, and when they were not in session, of the Roman Pontiffs, with the consent or acquiescence of the body of Bishops dispersed over the world. We had also in our simplicity believed, that even these did not always decide on controverted points, but only in cases in which the teaching of revelation was clear and explicit, and that in other matters, they wisely allowed a reasonable latitude of opinion. But D'Aubigné has taught us better. He would have us believe that Roman Catholics are bound hand and foot, body and soul, and that they are not allowed even to reflect.

This was emphatic language, yet strange to say, even after this, we find this same Martin John Spalding, when Archbishop of Baltimore, present at the late Vatican Council proclaiming the infallibility of the Pope.

Cardinal Manning, of England, then Archbishop, was also present at the Vatican Council of 1870, and, like Bishop Spalding, was an earnest advocate of the dogma of infallibility. We learn, from a work by the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, entitled *Vaticanism*, pages 92 and 93, that within the last few years, even up to the meeting of the Vatican Council of 1870, Kenan's

catechism was widely used in both England and America, in which there was the following question and answer: Question, "Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?" Answer, "This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body, that is the Bishops of the Church." The author of this catechism, in his preface, spoke of it as having the high approbation of Archbishop Hughes, of America, and also of the Rev. Drs. Kyle, Carruthers, Gilles and Murdock, the last four being Vicars Apostolic of their respective districts in Scotland. We have also seen it stated in a note to a work called "The Vatican Council," page 132, that this catechism was praised by Cardinal Manning's own journal, "*The Tablet*." Yet these men would have us now believe that they only teach doctrines which were always, and everywhere received and acknowledged. The catechism referred to is still published, but the above question and answer are left out. Comment upon this is unnecessary.

We will mention one other fact connected with this subject and close. Our Saviour said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and He also said, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." But not so with the Roman Pontiffs. Gregory the 7th forbade Henry the 4th, king of Germany and emperor-elect, to govern the kingdom of the Germans and of Italy. In commenting on this fact in his work entitled the Primacy, pages 356 and 357, the Archbishop says, "At length, in the year 1080, he drew it from the scabbard in a Roman Council, subjected him to excommunication, binding him with the chains of anathema, forbidding him anew on the part of Almighty God and the Apostles Peter and Paul, to take on himself the kingdom of the Germans and of Italy." Boniface the 8th said, "We declare to every human creature, we affirm, define, and pronounce, that it is altogether necessary for salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." This will be found in the famous Bull called "Unam Sanctam." Boniface, when admonishing Philip the Fair of France, said, "God has placed us over kings and kingdoms, to root up, pull down, waste, destroy, build up, and plant in His name and by His doctrine; wherefore



imagine not that you have no superior, and that you are not subject to the head of the Church."

Still later than this, a Bull of excommunication and deposition was fulminated by Pius the 5th, which was renewed by Sextus the 6th against Elizabeth, the queen of England. Bishop Kenrick defends, as best he can, this bold assumption of power, and in his work on the Primacy, page 365, says :

Philip the second of Spain prepared to give effect to the Papal decree, by a formidable fleet, the Armada, which, by a mysterious act of Providence, became the sport of the winds, leaving the bold daughter of Anne Boleyn, to pursue securely her career.

We may add that the same mysterious Providence which defended Elizabeth, permitted the Papal States to be taken from the Pope in a few days, or weeks, after he was proclaimed infallible.

In conclusion we have merely to remark, that if our readers can believe that Popes are infallible, and that Pope Boniface was right when he said, that God had placed them "over kings and kingdoms, to root up, pull down, waste, destroy, etc.," and believe him again when he said, "We declare to every human creature, we affirm, define, and pronounce that it is altogether necessary for salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontiff," then they should render their allegiance to the Pope; but if they cannot accept as truth, these extraordinary assumptions of power, so contrary to all sound polity, and national independence, and so contrary to the teaching of the Holy Bible, then they can never place themselves in subjection to Vatican Bulls and decrees.

We have many near and dear friends among the Roman Catholics to whom we are linked by the strongest ties of friendship and social intercourse. We have known many of them from boyhood, and have been and are most sincerely attached to them, and we trust that the day will soon come when all men in every civilized country in the whole world will be allowed to follow the honest convictions of their own minds in all religious matters.

All Christians hope for salvation through the merits and suffering and mediation of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ; and fortunately in our own happy country, we all are free to believe as we please, and there are none to molest us. Here Protestants and Romanists can worship where and when they please, build as

many churches as they please, and all are alike protected by wholesome laws.

But it is not so in all countries. When the Pope held supreme sway in Rome, no Protestant Church was allowed within its confines, but fortunately ours is a progressive age, and under the sceptre of Victor Emmanuel there is religious toleration. In his Church, however, the Pope is still imperial; he can make and unmake Cardinals and Bishops; his will is the law of the Church.

As a general thing we believe the Roman Catholics in this country wish for religious toleration; but unfortunately for them, as they have accepted the recent dogma of infallibility whenever the Pope shall differ from them they will be placed in rather a trying dilemma.

Let us hope that the day has passed away, and passed away to return no more when the torture, and the faggot and the flame will confront any man or woman because they do not believe in predestination, infallibility, immersion, or the tenets of our own Church. Let us recollect that our Divine Master was forgiving and full of compassion, and that when in their zeal the Apostles James and John would have called down fire from heaven to consume those Samaritans who would not receive Him because "His face was as though He would go to Jerusalem;" He rebuked them saying, "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

SAMUEL B. CHURCHILL.

## THE ONE BODY.

When one hears this saying of St. Paul, "There is one Body," (Eph. iv., 4), there comes at once into thought the whole meaning of the word a Body—a Body in all its parts and interconnections and in all its realness. It is no phantom, but a Body.

Next, there comes in mind the *Oneness* of this Body. It is the One Body of the One Christ. Hence, in each of the four senses in which the word, "the Body of Christ" is used in Holy Scripture, we find that the Body of that One only Person is meant Who being Eternal Son of God deigned to become Son of Man. Thus, the Body of Christ, whether we mean that veritable Body which God took in the womb of her who bore Him; or that Spiritual Body wherewith He rose again out of Mother Earth; or that Sacramental Body wherewith He feeds us to Everlasting Life and by which He will raise us at the last day; or again, that Mystical Body of which He is Himself the Head; is in each of these four uses of the word, a Real Body, somewhere and to-day existing. It is the *One* Body of the One Christ.

This Body is no loose, disjointed skeleton of unbelonging, separate, or severed parts, but *one* Body. Nor is it a *dead* Body. It is the living Body of that Living Christ, who was once dead indeed, but who is now alive forevermore. It is the compact, exact, infitness by which Adam's word about Eve is true of the Second Adam. The Lord Jesus may rightly say of His Resurrection Body, of His Sacramental Body, of His Mystical Body, "This is Bone of my Bones and Flesh of my Flesh."

Here, in the Christ, is that true marvel of a new Creation—a building whose maker is God—a temple not made with hands. Here also is the true Adam, the true Protoplast, as the Christian Fathers called the first Adam. Here is that true forming out of earthliness which God wrought when He first made a man in His

own image—the image of the future Christ ; and then, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, re-created him in a new creation in His own Similitude. The first Adam was of the earth, and as earthy only earthy. The second man is the Lord from Heaven, not only a living soul, but also a quickening Spirit. Nay, more, the Second Adam, Christ, is not only similitude of God His Father, but veri-similitude, since in Him dwells the fulness of the Godhead *Bodily*. It is not simply as example and pattern of all Holiness that our Christ saves us, but by the offering of His *Body* once for all on the Altar of the Cross. The real Christ is once offered up for Sin.

Out of this wonderful mechanism St. Paul brings, not merely illustrations, but facts (1) concerning the verity of our Resurrection in the power of the Risen and Living Christ ; (2) as concerning the Oneness of Christ's Mystical Body—the Church ; and (3) as regards the One Bread of this Eucharistic Feast.

Here is a Body which is *One*. A Body which is in truth undivided, but which is nevertheless divisible. Like the human body, it may be torn, or rent, or cut asunder. As in the human body, there may be schisms in the Mystical Body. But it is no loving, kindly hand that does that work. There may be schisms *from* the Body of Christ, but not without the schismatics, the makers and creators of schisms. But, Oh ! miracle of miracles, notwithstanding all schisms, there is a Oneness of Christ's Body which is Divine. No human machinations can destroy that Divine Unity.

Next: This Body is perfect as a whole, and perfect only thus. Its several parts are perfect, only as parts of the perfect whole. The severed hand, the separated foot, are each in themselves perfect as a foot or hand ; but, cut off from their own one body, they are dead members. They are nothing except as members of the one living whole. Each skeleton has its own inknitness. Its several parts make up its perfect and undivided whole. It is possible for the anatomist to join together the distinct and disjointed parts of several bodies, and out of these to construct what, for his uses, is a perfect skeleton. But no man knows better than he does that this is no creation of a body. These several parts of several bodies, are not *One Body*. Nay, after all is done, he cannot re-cover these fleshless bones with flesh, with nerve and sinew and skin ; he cannot re-clothe dry bones with life.

There meets all scientists and sciolists their one grim master—Death. It comes to all, unwished for, hoped against, nay, it may be, prayed against. It withers—its grey, cold, ghastly, deadly touch! There is no *earthly* body that it reaches not. It uncovers and unhides all fleshliness to leave nothing but the bones men handle so heedlessly, or out of which they propose to construct theories about races, or any theory of creation so they can escape God. Death has no teaching as regards *any* future for such as these. They know nothing of any Spiritual Body, and stand aghast before God's permitted revelations that souls live and that bodies may be personated.

We take that fact at once in hand; we will not and do not question that devils assume to-day human shapes and forms. What matters it, so we Christians know who works the miracle—this appearance of “raising the dead.” In the common Sadducaic denial of any resurrection, and equally common unbelief in either angel, or devil, or spirit, who shall say that God does not give Satan permission to prove himself? Nay, more, we might grant to modern Spiritualism all its boasted power to personate dead souls, or to bring into pictured life semblances of dead bodies. But how about these bodies? The bodies of our dead are dead, utterly gone into corruption, loathsome, hateful in the sight of those that loved them. Is it these bodies which they reproduce, or, is it the glorious, changed, incorruptible, immortal bodies which St. Paul promises and pledges as the gift of the last great day? Need we add that in spite of all the lying and deceivable wonders of our day, we will abide by, as we accept the faith of all Christendom that no *resurrection* to an enduring life is possible until the second coming of the *One Body* at the second coming of the One Head!

Holy Scripture, indeed, is most explicit in its binding up our whole life not only here but hereafter in the One Man Christ. We are new born in Him the One New Born. We are alive in Christ the living Lord. We are crucified, dead and buried in and with Him. We are risen already, now, to-day, out of deathliness in sin, to new life in His grace. We come to die—to wait, to rest, to hope, to expect, to long and look for a final and *One* Resurrection, when all manhood shall as *one* Body, spring at once into life.



As God grants to every seed its own body, so grants He to man. He gives to each soul its own one body. Reach it in what way we will, we come to the truth which is an axiom. There is One Body. There is one Body of the one Man Christ. We are each of us singly men; whether we be, as to-day we are, living souls, clothed with flesh and bone, or whether we be, as we shall each yet be (unless the Christ come in our day) living souls who lay aside this shell and burthen to take *it* again, re-made again at the last great day. That last great day shall be like the first—God shall make these dry bones live.

St. Paul says of us Christians, "Ye are the Body of Christ and members in particular." It is as members of the Living Christ that we are to-day alive spiritually. It is only as members of His Body that we shall yet stand forth and be clothed upon with immortality. As God kept His first Adam, whilst he was sinless, alive in Paradise by the fruit of the Tree of Life; so, we are made alive, are kept alive by the Lord Jesus Christ, the true fruit of the true tree, "I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Me." In the last re-creating day, the Christ shall remake all souls and all bodies to the measure and stature of perfect manhood. In the interim there is no perfect manhood except that of the One Lord and One Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus. The souls of the dead are in the hand of God in their appointed waiting place—a place whence they *cannot* go forth without direct permission of Almighty God, until that day when God makes up His jewels. Their bodies wait their bringing out of earth in that day when angels shall gather God's elect from the four winds of Heaven. Together shall the soul and body of the future man arise, together, and not before that day. It is just as impossible to divide the body and soul of the risen man as it is impossible to separate the Godhead and Manhood in the one Person Christ.

We have written thus much because it is part of the verity of our Lord's Resurrection that He rose with His own one Body. And our Resurrection shall be after His pattern and likeness, and there can be none other. "Handle me and see," saith He, "for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." The Christian faith does not allow us to believe in any new sort of fleshless,

boneless Christ—a bodiless Christ, a spiritual nonentity—a mere spiritual power or influence. The Christ of Christianity is to-day a person who is very God and very Man. So, when St. Stephen saw Heaven open, He saw no mere vision but that Word of Life, whom St. John tells us Apostles had seen and handled. So again, the Jesus who met Saul the persecutor, long years after His Ascension, was no spectral phantom. It was not an angel; it was not a spirit, but the Man Christ Jesus who was risen out of death, and Who could alone so appear, since He is not only Man but God. In a word, if we think and believe rightly as regards our Divine Lord's resurrection, we shall rightly believe concerning the resurrection of His One Mystical Body. "As we have been planted together in the likeness of His Death we shall be also in the likeness of His Resurrection." It is a heresy not only of Apostolic times, but of our own day which denies the Resurrection *of the body*. Hence, as against such a heresy, the creeds are most explicit, and none more so than that of Athanasius in its affirmation. What says it? "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ, who suffered, rose again, ascended and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies." It is not Resurrectio animarum, or Resurrectio hominum, but Resurrectio *carnis*.

As St. Paul has it—"Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself took part of the same that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." But, it is when this mortal shall have put on immortality, that the saying shall be fulfilled, "Death is swallowed up in victory." In the meanwhile, no resurrection of the body can be had, except to another death.

There are ten Resurrections recorded in Holy Scripture. Three in the Old Testament, three by our Lord Himself, His own Resurrection of Himself as the central Resurrection of them all, and three after His Resurrection. Nine of these resurrections are to another death. Of one only is it said—of Christ—that He being risen from the dead, dieth no more. First the son of the widow of Sarepta is raised by the stretching of the body of Elijah three

times on the body of the child. Next, the staff of Elisha is laid on the Shunamite's son, and twice he stretches himself on the child. And third, the bones of the dead Elisha bring to life the man that touched them. In each of these instances resurrection comes by touch and contact with the dead. By touch, and by the power of His voice the Lord of Life raises Jairus' daughter, the son of the widow of Nain, and the dead Lazarus. In each of these instances the bodies of the dead are present. In all six it is those lately dead who are raised to life. It is no absent body which is reproduced. After our Lord's Resurrection we are told that many bodies of the Saints which slept arose, while St. Peter raises Dorcas by the power of touch and prayer, and St. Paul, after the example of Elijah and Elisha, embraces the dead Eutychus and "his life is in him." In these two latter instances also, it is by direct touch and contact with the present dead that the miracle occurs. The Lord Jesus *calls* His dead Lazarus forth. He raises *Himself* from death as having power to lay down His life and power to take it again; and, as the first-fruits of the grave, He brings with Him on His first Easter a company of saints. As though to teach us that at the second Easter He will shake not only earth but heaven also, when all the dead shall hear His voice and come forth. No such other miracle is anywhere recorded.

It may be said by these modern miracle-mongers that they claim no resurrection; we then will at once use the infidel cry common among the Corinthians, "with what body do they come?" What body do they intend to produce? There is a natural body and a spiritual body. Any raising of the dead to-day must be either the revivifying of the dead natural body, or else the impossible (impossible before Christ's second coming) creation of the Spiritual Body. Of only *One* is it recorded that He saw no corruption. It is of Him of Whom we are taught that while His body was in the grave, and His soul in Paradise, His Godhead was indivisibly united to both soul and body. In these nine other resurrections the corruptible did not put on incorruption, while the only instance of the re-creation of bodies was that of the dead saints. They who rise at the last day do not die any more. Nay, more, (we refer to this with some diffidence as a doubtful matter), there

is a final ordeal through which man must pass at that day when Jesus shall judge the world. Then every man's work shall be tried by fire. There can be no revivifying of the Body of Christ until Christ shall baptize with fire. Whatever that one fiery trial may be, it is manifest from Holy Scripture that it shall not be until that final day of judgment. In the meanwhile no Resurrection of the body to immortality is possible.

We pass by here the ten recorded appearances of our Lord between His Resurrection and Ascension, with two remarks: First, it is impossible to conceive of this Risen Lord as governed as to His Human Nature by any such laws as those which control our yet unrisen bodies. Second—It is also true that until the Resurrection—the *final* resurrection—the dead can have no such powers or attributes as had His body or His soul. What shall be these powers, what these *gifts*, we may not know until we wake up after His likeness. They are gifts—superadded powers of that day of days. Certain is it that no such miracle-life as that which the Man Christ lived in the great forty days, was ever claimed for the risen Lazarus, or for those who like him rose out of death to die again.

We must not be understood as doubting or denying that there have been other resurrections of those recently or just dead since the raising of Eutychus by St. Paul, *e. g.*, such as those about whom Irenæus testifies. But these also have been resurrections not to a supernatural life, with power of appearing or disappearing at their own will, or at the will of others, or with bodily presences which may be seen and not touched. These have been resurrections to the common life of men, and a second tasting of death. In all the race there are but two who died not—Enoch and Elijah—and yet, if these are the Two Witnesses of whom St. John speaks in his Revelation, these also shall die in the end of the world.

The "quick" of the last day are they who are *then* alive and remain when the Lord returns with angels to gather men. He brings with Him no company of glorified saints to begin His glory, no galaxy of *men* resplendent in His lent majesties, but, His Angelic hosts. The Trump of God shall wake the dead. Then, we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up to meet the

Lord. It is one upspringing into life of Christ's One Body. We know that it was once a mooted question whether the "quick" at Christ's judgment day should not die that day. We know also that it has been asserted that the risen Saints of the First Easter did not die again; but these are guesses that pass beyond what is revealed. Nay, we will go further. It is not said in Holy Scripture, that the saints arose—but that many *bodies* of the saints arose. It is asserted of them that they went into the Holy City, and is it not there *only* that they appeared? They appeared not to all, but to many. Is it not *only* in the True Holy City, the Jerusalem of God's Church that resurrections are possible? And again: It is *not* in all ages and in all times that God permits *such* a miracle to be seen—but in some—the "many" of the Church's first glory. These *bodies* of the saints arose to prove to Christian people, that bodies of the dead may rise. It is not Christ alone Who rises, but the bodies of His saints. But in all His showings to His disciples, none of these are with Him. And, in His Ascension He mounts *alone*.

Besides these ten appearances of our Lord, and His showings to St. Stephen and St. Paul, and besides these appearances of the bodies of the saints, there are three appearances of men about which we have a word to say—of Samuel to Saul, and of Moses and Elijah to Peter and James and John.

It is not the body but the soul of Samuel that appeared to Saul, and God permitted the miracle—it may be with intent to prove that souls *live*. Twice are we told in Holy Scripture of the burial place of Samuel, and one of these instances in direct connection with this very piece of forbidden necromancy. It was in His own house in Ramah—the Ramah of Benjamin in Judah. Saul does not go to Ramah, where the body of Samuel lies, dead, buried and mourned for long before. He passes out of Judea through Samaria and into Galilee, and finds the woman that had a familiar spirit in Endor. As it is written in Ecclesiasticus—"After his death he (Samuel) prophesied and showed the king his end and lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy." (Ecclus. xlv., 20). So, in prophecy, Saul "perished in Endor and became as the dung of the earth."

Here is a prophecy of instant fulfilment. Are any *such* proph-



ecies uttered by personated souls to-day? The blood of martyred Abel cried aloud from the earth, and by it, as St. Paul saith, he being dead yet speaketh. But here the soul of the persecuted Samuel speaks the only recorded words of any soul that was dead except three—the Words of God, the Risen Word—the saying of Abraham to Dives and the cries of God's waiting saints. One need not tell here of what sort are the revelations made in our day. It suffices for us Christians to remember the explicit teaching of St. Paul: "The Spirit (of God) speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and teachings of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy." St. John commands us to try the spirits—all that profess to be such. We are to try them by their fruits—the fruit of their lives and the fruit of their doctrines. It is confession of the Christ come in the Flesh—the Master and Head and Lord of the One Body. It is confession of Him by life and word and deed that proves the spirit to be of God. One may grant the miracles, the revelations, the mutterings and whisperings of our modern spiritualism, but they are no *such* miracles, no *such* revelations, no *such* teachings as are given forth in boldness, in clarification in the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God. The Rod of God's Cross, like the rod of Moses, swallows up all false miracles and lying wonders.

So, near this very Endor, on Mount Tabor, as tradition has it; near where this woman summons up a dead soul to her own horror and wonder, the Man Christ Jesus is transfigured in the sight of the chosen three; and there appeared unto them Moses who was dead, and Elijah who had not died. Here were with Him Moses and the Law, with Elias and the Prophets—both transfigured in the Gospel of our God and Christ. Here dead Moses and living Elias are alive once more and seen of men, that these might know the Majesty of His second coming with all the living and all the dead. It is said of Enoch that "He was not found for God took him." It is told of Elijah that men found him not. And when Moses died no man knew of his sepulchre, nor should we have known anything of the circumstances of his burial (if buried he was) except for the revealed contest about his body, between Michael the Archangel and Satan. Whence came the bod-

ies of Moses and Elias, appearing at the Transfiguration, or whither they went, or whether they were present in the body at all, we do not know. All that is recorded is their appearance, their disappearance and the *subject* of their talking with our Lord.

In direct contrast to this Transfiguration of our Divine Lord, there is another transformation of which Holy Scripture warns us, the transformation of Satan into an Angel of Light. There seems to be summed up here all the power which is his by permission, the power of possession, of in-dwelling in men's bodies and souls, that personal touching the race of which his usage of Job is both a type and an example. Hating man as the image and similitude of the man Christ Jesus, what wonder if he seek to defile, debauch and destroy both body and soul in hell! What wonder if he uses every art and wile against the One Body of the One Lord! It is manhood's fight with all deviltry, which was *begun* when God was made a little lower than the angels. It will be manhood's final victory when the last enemy shall be destroyed. It is not simply, or only, the horrors and anguishes of very grievous disease which meet the One Physician Christ; not the mere madness, the debauchery, or dire sin-sickness of souls bereft of grace; but every outshow of the might of the Prince of the Power, of the Air. There are demons who make men dumb who should be praising God and making confession of the faith. There are devils that suggest all doubts, and denials, and difficulties, that put against the Christian speech, "never man spake as this Man," the blasphemy "these are the words of one that hath a devil," that urge the cry "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of devils," when Christ's Christian sons cast them out by prayer and fasting. It is the devil that has the power of death. Is it strange if he counterfeit his own destruction, and pass off on those who readily accept any delusion, his mockeries of God's final miracle? His deceivableness reaches to persuasion to believe any lie, and false gospel, and especially to the bringing in of damnable heresies, even to the denial of the Lord, Who bought men with the priceless price of His own body.

In brief, as there are four uses of the word, the Body of Christ, so are there four direct attacks upon the One Body by the arch-

enemy of man. 1. He spent out every snare and wile against the Natural Body of the Incarnate God. 2. He wars against the risen and ascended manhood—the spiritual body of the one and only mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus; suggesting will-worship, worship of angels and saints; deifying nature, yea, even himself. 3. Lest we Christians should discern the Lord's Eucharistic Body, he teaches that men may be partakers of the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. And 4. He wars against Christ's Mystical Body in heresies and heresiarchs, schisms and schismatics, in lawlessness, in false teachers, false prophets, and false Christs. Nay, as in the days of the Head, there may be to-day Judases of whom the Lord may say as of their prototype, "Have I not chosen you, and one of you hath a devil."

We have attempted to suggest a method of dealing with a matter which more and more forces itself upon attention—this widespread evil of a *lying* spiritualism. It is not all an utter untruth. Like every other lie against God's Gospel, it has its foundation in Truth. It denies and it accepts. It is *αἵρεσις*, heresy—the choice of opinion. The world persuades itself that there cannot be any Resurrection or that the Resurrection is past already, and straightway it launches itself into the most gross and most silly superstitions, and ends in all debauchery and license. It persuades itself that it is wiser than God's Revelation of Himself in the Person of the One Master Man, and sinks to the ditch of hell in its wisdoms and knowledges. It hates all godliness and the sweet yoke of the obedience of the faith, and submits itself with greediness to lechery and all unholiness. It rejects the Christ, dethrones Him from all hearts and would mount, if it could, to pluck God out of Heaven, to seat there in His place and stead the gods of greed, of gain, of lust.

CHARLES M. PARKMAN.

## DANTE'S INFERNO.

Dante Alighieri, of Florence, died in the month of July, 1321, A. D. The political and ecclesiastical references in the Divine Comedy are so numerous and perplexing that my Italian teacher in the city of Rome preferred to delay my study of it until I had become more thorough in my knowledge of the language and of the history of Italy—very different from my teacher in German, who set me to work as soon as possible on the perusal of Schiller's *Maid of Orleans* and Goethe's *Torquato Tasso*.

Perplexing as are the references in the Divine Comedy, its scenes form a favorite subject for the brush of the artist, and its sentences are in the mouths of every cultivated conversationalist. It stands in literature on a level with Shakespeare.

Let me introduce to the reader the man himself—his appearance is in keeping with his sombre and Divine theme. I would describe him in the words of the poet Boccaccio, who says "Dante was of middle height, and after reaching mature years he went somewhat stooping; his gait was grave and sedate; always clothed in most becoming garments; his dress was suited to the ripeness of his years; his face was long; his nose aquiline; his eyes rather large than small; his jaw heavy, and his under lip prominent; his complexion was dark, and his hair and beard thick, black, and crisp, and his countenance was always sad and thoughtful." "His manners, whether in public or at home, were wonderfully composed and restrained, and in all his ways he was more courteous and civil than any one else."

This portraiture agrees in every respect save one with the appearance to which we have become familiar from the beautiful engraving of Dante and Beatrice, which adorns the parlour or library of the cultivated and the refined—the exception consists in the "thick, black, and crisp beard," mentioned by Boccaccio,

which is wanting in those representations of the poet, and the explanation of this difference is found in the fact,—that the likeness of Dante has been obtained from two sources,—the one a painting made by Giotto, and found on the walls of the chapel of the Podesta Palace in Florence, now called the Barzello Palace, and the other a mask, which conforms entirely to the description by Boccaccio of the poet's countenance, save that it is beardless. This difference is to be accounted for by the fact that to obtain the cast the beard had to be removed.

It is a coincidence that the pictures of Dante and of Shakespeare have been preserved by a portrait and by a mask; the one taken in life and the other after death, and that in both cases disputes have arisen because of certain *dissimilitudes* between the portrait and the cast—in Dante's there is no scar as in the cast of Shakespeare to contradict the portrait, yet as the portrait of Dante by Giotto was painted when he was a youth of twenty years, in all the freshness and buoyancy of life, it differs from the mask taken after his death, from a face furrowed with the trials and experiences of a life arrived at the age of fifty and six years.

The theme selected by the greatest poet of Italy, and of mediæval times, opens with the Inferno,—hell and its torments,—he stays not to question its existence, but plunges in *medias res*.

The Inferno is a theme which forces its claims upon our thoughts and has given wonderful scope to the pen of Dante Alighieri, whose words have been recently translated for our English reading public in an able rendition by Parsons, and also by our American poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

Posterity has done honor to this mighty drama, and the poet himself did not hesitate to ascribe fame to his work when, in his address to Virgil, he says :

Thou art my Master, and my Author thou,  
Thou art alone the one from whom I took  
The beautiful style that has done honor to me.

CANTO i, 85-87.

There are, however, few who have so carefully studied the order and plan of the poem of Dante as to understand its merits—all record his name on the Temple of Fame, yet when they peruse his poem they lose their way amid the labyrinth of politi-



cal, pagan, and ecclesiastical allusions. Every other line requires a reference to copious notes; the metaphors are intricate as those in the Revelation of St. John; the leopard, the lion and the hungry wolf, which, on his entrance into the "Inferno," affright him, were standards of the leaders who divided Italy and Europe between the rival factions of Guelphs and of Ghibelines; yet these identical beasts were also suggested by the prophecy of Jeremiah; thus do sacred and secular allusions blend throughout the poem.

To conjure up the scenes of the poet's entrance and walk in the Inferno, assistance has of late been rendered by the pencil of Gustav Doré. The reader may have seen the pictures of this artist in which Virgil, with the bloodless pallor of death, and Dante, with the affrighted lineaments of the living, rove side by side the abodes of darkness; no Arctic winter was ever more dismal. Dante drags himself out of the visible world into the invisible, as he describes in his poem:

And even as he, who, with distressful breath,  
Forth issued from the sea upon the shore,  
Turns to the water perilous and gazes;  
So did my soul that still was fleeing onward,  
Turn itself back to re-behold the pass  
Which never yet a living person left.

CANTO i. 22-27.

The poet stands on the shores of the Inferno, and is appalled yet fascinated by his position—it is at first the sensation of a complete withdrawal and isolation from the world.

Oft have I seen at some cathedral door,  
A laborer, passing in the dust and heat,  
Lay down his burden, and with reverent feet  
Enter, and cross himself, and on the floor  
Kneel to repeat his Pater Noster o'er;  
Far off the noises of the world retreat;  
The loud vociferations of the street  
Become an undistinguishable roar.  
So, as I enter here from day to day,  
And leave my burden at this minster gate,  
Kneeling in prayer, and not ashamed to pray,  
The tumult of the time disconsolate  
To inarticulate murmurs dies away,  
While the eternal ages watch and wait.  
Ah! from what agonies of heart and brain,  
What exultations trampling on despair,

What tenderness, what tears, what hate of wrong,  
 What passionate outcry of a soul in pain,  
 Uprose this poem of the earth and air,  
 This mediæval miracle of song.

The oldest tradition reports hell as situated in the nethermost part of the earth, yet the first step of Dante was upward; he ascends, -

So that the firm foot ever was the lower.

CANTO i. 30.

The structure of each valley doth import  
 That one bank rises and the other sinks.

CANTO xxiv. 40.

It was not for mortals to enter the abodes of the dead without a guide. Dante had attempted to do so, but was speedily sent flying back to earth, and was arrested in his flight by a proffered guide, the Pagan poet Virgil, who could show him hell, but was not permitted to enter heaven.

Because that Emperor, who reigns above,  
 In that I was rebellious to his law  
 Wills that through me none come into his city.

The guide to heaven must be a Christian; to hell this Pagan poet will answer, who has for centuries ceased his song—a fact beautifully expressed in the 63d line of the 1st Canto:

Who seemed from long-continued silence hoarse.

No mortal save Æneas, the founder of Rome, the seat of the Cæsar, and St. Paul "the chosen vessel," had ever pierced to the Inferno.

As he is, who unwill's what he willed,  
 And by new thoughts doth his intention change,  
 So that from his design he quite withdraws,  
 Such I became, upon that dark hillside.

To which hesitancy Virgil replied:

Thy soul attainted is with cowardice,  
 Which many times a man encumbers so,  
 It turns him back from honoured enterprize,  
 As false sight doth a beast, when he is shy.

CANTO ii. 45-48.

Virgil has come from a vision of the beautiful Beatrice.

Me it behooves to show him the dark valley;  
 Necessity, and not delight, impels us.

Some one withdrew from singing hallelujah,  
Who unto me committed this new office;

CANTO xii. 88-89.

Virgil obeyed with alacrity the heavenly vision.

So grateful unto me is thy commandment,  
To obey, if 'twere already done, were late;

CANTO ii. 79-80-

There are 34 Cantos to the Inferno. It is my intention to confine myself to this theme and not to pass on to the consideration of the Purgatorio and Paradiso, but to give a clear idea of the doleful region as it presented itself to the most gifted imagination of mediæval times.

The aim of the poet Milton was to make the Inferno indefinite; therefore he describes it as wild and fenceless, and as illimitable space; whereas Dante's aim was to make it definite. He described it in separate circles, "drawn with well pointed-compasses," and crossed, as were mediæval moats, by carefully guarded draw-bridges, circle within circle; the entire Inferno shaped like "a doleful Conch" shell; the first convolution, the largest in diameter, and each successive one narrowing until the last one becomes a point occupied by Judas Iscariot and by Satan. Thus Virgil and Dante wind round and round from shelf to shelf, from circle to circle, from convolution to convolution, as those who descend from a mountain-height into a deep valley, each circle revealing a new vista, and bringing nearer the depths below.

And the guide said:

One am I who descends .

Down with this living man from cliff to cliff,

And I intend to show hell unto him.

CANTO xxix. 94-96.

But ere they enter upon the "deep and savage way" they pass under the gate on whose arch is inscribed the oft repeated sentence:

Through me the way is to the city dolent;  
Through me the way is to eternal dole;  
Through me the way among the people lost.  
Justice incited my sublime Creator;  
Created me, Divine Omnipotence,  
The highest wisdom and the primal Love.

All hope abandon, ye who enter in!  
These words in sombre colour I beheld  
Written upon the summit of a gate.

CANTO iii. 1-11.

The people dolorous first encountered are "a lamentable crew," too good for hell and too worthless for heaven; neither altogether good nor totally corrupt; neither courageous nor cowardly; neither cold nor hot; spewed out from the mouth of God and rejected even by the jaws of hell.

What folk is this which seems by pain so vanquished?  
And he to me: This miserable mode  
Maintain the melancholy souls of those  
Who lived withouten infamy or praise.  
Commingle are they with that caitiff choir  
Of angels, who have not rebellious been,  
Nor faithful were to God, but were for self.  
The heavens expelled them not to be less fair;  
Nor them the nethermore abyss receives,  
For glory none the damned would have from these.

CANTO iii. 33-43.

Among this "miserable mode" the impartial criticism of the poet hesitates not to place Pope Celestine V.,

Who made through cowardice the great refusal—

he "being a simple man and of holy life," living as a hermit in the mountains of Morrone, had no sooner accepted the election to the Pontificate than he was affrighted to abdicate through fear of the responsibilities of the office; he refused that which had been imposed upon him by the Holy Spirit, and as a moral coward he deserved to be consigned to hell. There is a lesson in this which forewarns the shirking of responsibility on the part of any creature of God.

From this abode of the unprofitable the poet fords the river of death and crosses "the dusky wave."

This way there never passes a good soul.

CANTO iii. 127.

The ferry of Charon and the dark river pertain not to the saved; by another way they cross from the finite to the infinite. The poet has entered the Inferno.

The land of tears gave forth a blast of wind,  
And fulminated a vermillion light,  
Which overmastered in me every sense,  
And as a man whom sleep hath seized I fell.

CANTO iii. 133-136.

From this sleep he awakes to find himself in the foremost circle of the *nine* which make up the conch of the Inferno. The first circle, the largest in diameter, being the mouth of the convolutions, holds a medley people, the good and the wise Pagan poets and philosophers—Homer, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Hector, Æneas, Caesar, Brutus, “who drove Tarquin forth,” Lucretia, Cornelia, Plato, Socrates, Diogenes, Livy, Seneca and Euclid, and apart from the rest was the Saladin, who, on one occasion, rebuked the Christian chiefs for trampling under their feet the Cross, and who, moreover, exposed the vanity of worldly honors. In this limbo of the Inferno, Dante hesitates not to confine Virgil, his model and guide. True to his orthodoxy he questioned not the justice of assigning Socrates and Plato to the realms of the lost, and places also in this foremost circle the unbaptized, whether infants or adults.

To me the Master good; thou dost not ask  
What spirits these, which thou beholdest, are?  
Now will I have thee know, ere thou go farther,  
That they sinned not; and if they merit had,  
Tis not enough, because they had not baptism  
Which is the portal of the faith thou holdest;  
And if they were before Christianity,  
In the right manner they adored not God;  
And among such as these am I myself.  
For such defects, and not for other guilt,  
Lost are we, and are only so far punished,  
That without hope we live on in desire.

CANTO IV. 31-42.

And yet there is a flood of light thrown into the abode of this Pagan and this unbaptized multitude from the confession of Virgil of the fact of the descent of Christ into hell, and of his leading captivity captive, and giving saving gifts unto the dwellers in this foremost circle. Said Virgil:

I was a novice in this state,  
When I saw hither come a mighty one,  
With sign of victory incornate.  
Hence he drew forth the shade of the first parent,  
And that of his son Abel, and of Noah,  
Of Moses the law-giver, and the obedient  
Abraham, patriarch, and David, king,  
And others many, and He made them blessed.



Thus did Dante maintain the necessity for the believers under the Old Testament dispensation to await in the Inferno the advent of Christ ere they could be saved. His work of atonement must be accomplished first in order to take away sin and admit to heaven.

And thou must know, that earlier than these  
Never were any human spirits saved.

CANTO iv. 52-53.

THE SECOND CIRCLE contains the carnal malefactors, "who reason subjugate to appetite," and hence, here are found Queen Semiramis and Cleopatra, "the voluptuous;" and Helen of Troy, "for whom so many ruthless seasons revolved."

Alas!  
How many pleasant thoughts, how much desire,  
Conducted these unto the dolorous pass!

CANTO v. 113-114.

Models of physical beauty as were these renowned women, yet "lust, when it is conceived, bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is ended, bringeth forth death." The fear of lustful appetite, which consigns to the second circle of hell, has produced strange sectaries in the world, from the Shaker of Lebanon, who enforces celibacy as the alone virtuous state, to the Monk, who, by iron bars and cloistered walls, shuts out carnal appetites, and finally, to the chaste virgin,

Who walks in maiden meditation, fancy free.

Vice has made havoc so dire in the social relations of life that it deservedly claims the second circle of hell.

In the THIRD CIRCLE are those also subject to carnal appetites, but it confines itself to the grosser and "the pernicious sin of gluttony"—their punishment is expressed by the swine-like posture which they are made to assume.

They all were lying prone upon the earth,  
Battered by the rain.

CANTO vi. 37.

In the FOURTH CIRCLE were the avaricious.

Here saw I people, more than elsewhere, many,  
On one side and the other, with great howls,  
Rolling weights forward by main force of chest.

CANTO vii. 25-27.

Among them are especially mentioned :

Clerks those were, who no hairy covering  
Have on the head,  
In whom doth avarice practise its excess.

In Dante's time the bald-headed clerk indicated the money-maker, who, by close application and constant thinking, had heated his brain and grown bald—he may have been clerk, cashier, cardinal, or even Pope—the bald heads of to-day are a countless multitude of money-makers in every sphere of life.

Now caust thou, son, behold the transient farce  
Of goods that are committed unto Fortune,  
For which the human race each other buffet;  
For all the gold that is beneath the moon,  
Or ever has been, of those weary souls  
Could never make a single one repose.

CANTO vii. 61-66.

In the FIFTH CIRCLE are those whom "anger overcame."

Fixed in the mire they say, "We sullen were  
In the sweet air, which by the sun is gladdened,  
Now we are sullen in this sable mire."  
This hymn do they keep gurgling in their throats.

CANTO vii. 121-124.

In the SIXTH CIRCLE are the arrogant in belief, in word, and in action.

That was an arrogant person in the world;  
Goodness is none, that decks his memory;  
So likewise here his shade is furious.  
How many are esteemed great kings up there,  
Who here shall be like unto swine in mire,  
Leaving behind them horrible dispraises!

CANTO viii. 46-51.

In this circle stands the city of unbelief, inhabited by the Heresiarchs.

The walls appeared to me to be of iron.

And on approaching this dismal city the poet Virgil puts Dante on his guard against viewing the Medusa head, which will petrify his soul. "The hidden doctrine seems to be, that negation or unbelief is the Gorgon's head, which changes the heart to stone; after which there is no more returning upward. The furies display it from the walls of the city of heretics."

The dwelling-places of these citizens are not houses, but sepulchres, adapted to the rebuke of our Lord—"whited sepulchres—full of all uncleanness."

Here are the Heresiarchs,  
With their disciples of all sects, and much  
More than thou thinkest laden are the tombs.

CANTO ix. 127-129.

They are classed as arrogant, because such is scepticism, infidelity and atheism—it is presumption in thought and in word.

With Epicurus all his followers,  
Who with the body, mortal make the soul;

CANTO x, 14-15.

Here is Frederick the second, the infidel emperor of Germany; and here is the cardinal, who is accused of saying,

If there be any soul, I have lost mine—

Dante takes him at his word.

The SEVENTH CIRCLE has *three* divisions, one for those who injure their neighbors, a second for those who injure themselves, and a third for those who do violence to God.

Three small circles; from grade to grade  
Of every malice that wins hate in heaven,  
Injury is the end; and all such end  
Either by force or fraud afflicteth others.

But because *fraud* is man's peculiar vice,

More it displeases God; and so stand lowest,  
The fraudulent, and greater dole assails them,  
Ruin, arson, injurious levies; homicides,  
Marauders, freebooters, the first round tormenteth.

These sinners are consigned to a river of blood in hell,

Within which boiling is  
Whoe'er by violence doth injure others.  
O blind cupidity, O wrath insane,  
That spurs us onward so in our short life,  
And in the eternal then so badly steeps us!

Among these are Alexander the Great, and fierce Dionysius.

Tyrants are these, who dealt in bloodshed and in pillaging.  
Plunged in a river of blood they lament their pitiless mischiefs.

Those in the second round injure themselves; they are the suicides; all who have come to a violent death by their own hands

—"thinking by dying to escape disdain." Their punishment is their transformation into the trees of a forest; in which, if a branch or a sprig be broken off it weeps blood, and the trunk cries out:

Why dost thou mangle me?  
When the exasperated soul abandons  
The body whence it rent itself away,  
Minos consigns it to the seventh abyss,  
It falls into the forest.

The third round contains the violent against God—the blasphemers, who are punished in a sand-waste; in comparison to which the dolorous forest is a garland, for here were

Raining down dilated flakes of fire,  
As of the snow on Alp without a wind.

Here, too, are the violent against nature, and near them are the usurers or sinners against art.

From these the narrow path  
Crosses athwart the second dike, and forms  
Of that a buttress for another arch.

And hence begins the eighth circle.

THIS EIGHTH CIRCLE is made up of concentric circles or evil budgets—in the first are the seducers; in the second the flatterers—among them is Allessio, who took such delight in flattery, that "he besmeared every body, even the lowest menials." In the third round are the simoniacs, who sell the gift of God for money—Simon Magus was there, and Popes, who, for gain, have resorted to evil—hence, the poet censures the avaricious pastors and satirically asks:

I pray thee tell me now how great a treasure  
Our Lord demanded of St. Peter first,  
Before He put the keys into his keeping?  
Truly He nothing asked but follow Me.  
Nor Peter nor the rest asked of Matthias  
Silver or gold, when he by lot was chosen  
Unto the place the guilty soul had lost.  
Ye have made yourselves a god of gold and silver;  
And from the idolater how differ ye,  
Save that he one, and ye a hundred worship?  
Ah! Constantine! of how much ill was mother,  
Not thy conversion, but that marriage dower  
Which the first wealthy Father took from thee.

This for those mediæval times was a bold blow against the temporal power of the Pope.

In the fourth round of the eighth circle were the soothsayers, whose punishment consists in the *reversion* of their faces.

Towards the reins the countenance was turned.  
And backward it behooved them to advance,  
Because they wished to see too far before them  
In this life—in the next—  
Behind them look, and backward go their way.

Among these soothsayers is the famous Michael Scott, of "the Lay of the Last Minstrels."

Who of a verity  
Of magical illusion knew the game.

The fifth round holds the judges, who take bribes for giving judgment. They are plunged into boiling pitch, and when they attempt to uplift their heads the devils pull them back with rakes, and say :

It here behooves thee to dance covered,  
That, if thou canst, thou *secretly* mayest pilfer.

In the sixth round are the hypocrites.

A painted people there below we found,  
Who went about with footsteps very slow,  
They had on mantles gilded so as to dazzle;  
But inwardly are leaden.  
O! everlastingly fatiguing mantle!

The seventh round holds the thieves—amid a throng of serpents—who, by a strange transformation exchanged forms and countenances with them—reminding the thief that on earth he had skulked about subtle as a serpent—as a pickpocket, or a government contractor.

The eighth round holds the fraudulent counsellors—it was so rocky and ragged that,

Among the rocks and ridges of the crag,  
The foot without the hand sped not at all.

The poet had to go on all fours—and pass through a valley which shone with "flames as manifold resplendent as if the air had been filled with fire-flies and glow-worms—every flame a sinner steals away—each swathes himself with that wherewith he burns."



There were also cleft flames representing those who by fraud had betrayed each other, yet were compelled in hell to dwell together in a divided flame. Thus the two sons of *Ædipus*, who "were so hostile to each other," that, when after death their bodies were burned on the same funeral pile, the flames swayed apart and the ashes separated.

The ninth Round or *Bolgia* holds the schismatics—an immense multitude: "Each tongue would for a certainty fall short to tell of the number." Dante compares these to the hosts slain by *Hannibal* in the battle of *Cannæ* during the second Punic war, wherein such a number of wealthy Romans fell that the gold rings taken from their hands, on being measured, filled three pecks and a half.

Among these schismatics is *Mahomet*, whether he was an impostor or fanatic is not decided.

And all the others, disseminators of scandal and of schism—  
While living they rent men asunder.

Therefore, after death they are covered with wounds and are cleft in the face from "forelock unto chin."

The Tenth and last Round of *Malebolge* contains the falsifiers of all kinds. Here,

All the  
Diseases in one moat were gathered,  
Such was it here, and such a stench came from it,  
As from putrescent limbs is wont to issue.  
We step by step went onward without speech,  
Gazing upon and listening to the sick  
Who had not strength enough to lift their bodies.

CANTO XXIX., 70-76.

I saw two sitting leaned against each other,  
As leans in heating platter against platter,  
From head to foot bespotted o'er with scabs;  
And never saw I plied a curry-comb  
By stable-boy for whom his master waits,  
Or him who keeps awake unwillingly,  
As every one was plying fast the bite  
Of nails upon himself, for the great rage  
Of itching which no other succor had.

These falsifiers are compelled to confess,

I a skillful ape of nature was.

From these ten Rounds of the eighth Circle the poet comes upon the Plain of the Giants, which occupies the interspace between the last circle and the end or point of the Infernal Pit.

We turned our backs upon the wretched valley,  
Upon the bank that girds it round about,  
Going across it without any speech;  
There it was less than night, and less than day.

The Giants appeared like many lofty towers—the face of one was as long

As is at Rome the pine cone of St. Peter's,  
And in proportion were the other bones.

This pine cone of St. Peter's Church measures eleven feet, and therefore the Giant must have been seventy feet in height. One of the Giants was Nimrod,

By whose evil thought  
One language in the world is not still used.

Another Giant, "his hands extended, took up my guide, and of the guide and me one bundle made," and bending over as does the leaning tower at Bologna, Italy, amid the clouds, he lightly in the abyss put us down.

Nor thus bowed downward made he there delay,  
But, as a mast does in a ship, uprose.

Thus was gained the end or point of this Conch shaped hell.

If I had rhymes both rough and stridulous,  
As were appropriate to the dismal pole  
Down upon which thrust all the other rocks,  
I would press out the juice of my conception  
More fully; but because I have them not,  
Not without fear I bring myself to speak;  
For 'tis no enterprise to take in jest,  
To sketch the bottom of all the Universe.

CANTO xxxii., 1-8.

Look how thou steppest!  
Take heed thou do not trample with thy feet  
The heads of the tired, miserable brothers. The  
Host of traitors—Brutus, Cassius, etc.

The disconsolate shades were packed in ice, and when they wept, the frost congealed the tears and locked them up again.

Weeping itself there does not let them weep—  
Because the earliest tears a cluster form,

And, in the manner of a crystal visor,  
Fill all the cup beneath the eyebrow full.

The fratricidal Cain gives his name to this last circle—and many spirits are already in this Round of hell, whose bodies are still walking the earth under the possession of demons. There the traitor Judas and the devil, the Emperor of the Kingdom dolorous, "from his mid-breast forth issued from the ice"—the waving of his wings produced the three adverse winds which form the atmosphere of hell; and the only way by which Dante and his guide could climb out of the infernal pit was by sliding down the back of Satan to the centre of the globe; and then from the centre of gravity reverse their position and climb up his legs to the top of his toes, which just touched the surface of the globe. Dante could not at first comprehend this mode of exit, until Virgil explained that the figure of Satan was so huge that it measured from his head to his loins one radius of the earth, while from his loins to his feet another was measured—said Virgil:

That side thou wast, so long as I descended;  
When round I turned me, thou didst pass the point  
To which things heavy draw from every side.

Dante maintains the tradition that Satan falling from Heaven, struck the side of the globe directly opposite to Mt. Calvary, on an island of the South Pacific, called Purgatorio, opposite to that Land:

'Neath whose cope was put to death  
The man who without sin was born and lived.

Satan's body in its fall pierced the crust of the globe and his head passed downward beyond the centre of gravity and left his legs reaching up to the Mt. of Calvary, where Dante from his visit to hell,

Came forth to re-behold the stars,

the morning stars of Easter-day; the pledge of the Resurrection of the dead.

This was the idea of the Infernal Regions in the mind of the greatest of the Mediæval poets. Dante summed up the whole of the traditional lore, or at least with a poet's intuitive sagacity, seized on all which was most imposing, effective, and real, and condensed it in this poem. That hell had a local existence, that im-

material spirits suffered bodily and material torments, and that Dante was the one authorized topographer of the Mediæval hell; gathering from all ages, all lands, all races its imagery, its denizens, its rite, its horrors; from the old Jewish traditions, from the Pagan poets with their black rivers, their Cerberus, their boatman, and his crazy vessel—a hell peopled not alone by men and women of ancient times, but by Popes and Kings and citizens who but recently walked the streets and had an active existence in the affairs of to-day. There is in every enlightened mind “a tacit repugnance” to such a material hell; we shrink from its horrors aghast; we attribute it to superstition and to the fancies of the Dark Ages. Yet it is not a century ago since Jonathan Edwards wrote of hell paved with the skulls of infants; nor was this pavement of his own invention, for it dates back to St. Patrick’s Purgatory and to the vision of Frate Alberico, who was shown by St. Peter “a place filled with red hot burning cinders and boiling vapour, in which little children were bathed, those of one year old being subjected to this torment during seven days; those of two years, fourteen days; and so on in proportion to their age”—a marvelous reception for the tender babes whom Jesus took up in His arms and blessed, and whom He made the types of loving humility, and flung the desecrator of their innocence with a millstone round his neck into the depths of the sea.

Jonathan Edwards had a mighty intellect, he was versed in controversial theology; he gained his idea of hell from his theology, not from the face of nature which smiled upon him in great beauty. During the past summer I was permitted to visit the home of Jonathan Edwards and to behold the granite column which has been erected to his memory in the village of Stockbridge in Berkshire county, Mass., one of the loveliest villages in all America. It was the theology of Edwards which pictured to his mental vision the horrors of hell, while his natural eye was feasting on the loveliest fields and meadows and mountains and valleys. A scene of earthly Paradise made his Sabbath days serene and his home gladsome, while his pulpit resounded with the groans of the lost, and his mind was busy in conjuring up the frightful realities of a physical hell. So was it also with Dante—

a dweller in lovely Italy, with its mellow skies, its golden orange groves and its green olive yards; where the artists Titian and Raphael have dipped their brushes into the colors of the rainbow, there the sombre poet sang of "every prospect pleasing, but only man is vile."

There was in the life of Dante an experience which in a measure embittered his spirit. Not allowed, like Jonathan Edwards, to dwell under his own paternal roof, but driven forth an exile from the city of Florence, where he was a member of a noble family, and compelled to dwell among strangers and in comparative poverty, no wonder his thoughts dwelt upon the retribution of hell, and his poem took revenge upon such enemies. Yet this poem had a nobler intent; it was the utterance of a Reformer—not like Shakespeare, who wrote dramas to please and instruct, but as one who had the courage, in an age when men revered civil and ecclesiastical titles, and cravingly kissed the hands of Cardinals and the toes of Popes, boldly to declare the equality of all men in the sight of God, that He is no respecter of persons, and has not to think twice before He condemns a nobleman or a Pope to hell, if their deeds deserve such a penalty. The poem of Dante was a bold utterance for justice and equity, and exerted an influence for freedom and for human rights which marvellously affected the Italian mind and prepared the way for Luther and the Reformation. There is a heaven of bliss, and its antithesis is a hell of woe. There is a blot on the face of the Universe inhabited by the Devil and fallen angels and fallen men, and there is a star of the first magnitude which holds the many mansions for the good and true. There is a Divine condemnation of evil and a Divine reward for the good.

F. M. McALLISTER.



## A MARTYR'S MEMORIAL.

On a cold, blustering night in January, 1875, a clergyman in the city of New York was summoned to his front-door by a stranger who declined to give his name. The visitor was standing without the door, and was only induced after some persuasion to enter. His appearance when he did so was such as to excite immediate interest, for though he was but ill-clad and pinched by the cold, if not by hunger also, there was a simple dignity in his bearing which indicated innate refinement and more than usual culture. His head, when uncovered, disclosed to view a broad and strongly marked forehead, and there was a gentleness and ingenuousness in the expression of the eye, which at once enlisted confidence.

The stranger told his story and substantiated it by evidence which was beyond suspicion. He was a clergyman of the Church in Ireland, who had left his cure and his country under circumstances equally painful to himself and his people. He had come, as so many come, in search of a new and brighter future, and, like so many who have set out upon such an errand, he had failed to find it. Sickness had overtaken him and he had been an inmate of a city hospital, first as a patient, and afterwards as a nurse. When he sought the clergyman, to whom reference has been made, he was without friends, means, employment, or a home. He was thoroughly aroused to the mistakes of his past life, and was equally perplexed as to how he was to avoid repeating them. There were obvious difficulties in the way of his ecclesiastical transfer to the Church in this country, and he was unfitted, alike by training and by taste, for any other than his sacred calling. What was he to do, and how was he to live?

The problem was not easy of solution, but he contributed very largely to its solution himself. In the first place, he was willing to do anything to which he was set, and he was willing to do it

for no other compensation than his daily bread. Again, he was thoroughly aroused to the danger which any man incurs who is willing to deal leniently with an evil habit, and he acquiesced at once in a daily rule of life, in which renunciation in the direction of his particular peril was the first and absolute condition, and in which the most ceaseless vigilance on his own part was to be accompanied with the constant oversight of others. With a touching humility and self-distrust he gave up the ordering of his daily life into the hands of those under whom he was set to work, and on the very next day began his work with single and unflinching devotion.

It was such work as the humblest parish visitor or the least educated Bible reader might have done, and would, in fact, ordinarily be assigned to. But this cultivated, sensitive, gently-nurtured scholar,—the graduate of a foreign university and wonted to refined surroundings and highly educated companionships, gave himself to it as though he had no other ambition in the world. With a tenderness and devotion which won for him friends wherever he went, he spent his days and sometimes his nights too, in ministrations among the sick, the aged and the needy,—ministrations which have left behind them a fragrance as fresh to day as when he first entered the homes of those to whom he brought them. His life was one of ceaseless drudgery, unilluminated by any pause for recreation, and equally without the sunshine of any home fireside, when the day was done, to make that drudgery forgotten. And yet no one ever heard from him one slightest murmur of weariness, or saw upon his face any other than that expression of gentle patience, which those who once saw it will never forget. Above all, no one ever saw in him any slightest evidence that he had taken even one single step backward toward the infirmity from which, once for all he had, by the grace of God so resolutely wrenched himself. To the eyes of all men he was obviously moving upon a plane of single-hearted, stainless, and saintly service for the Master.

But though there was no impatience on his own part, there was something not unlike it in the minds of others. He was a clergyman of the Mother Church, with gifts and acquirements which fitted him for eminent usefulness in his sacred calling. Could not the way be opened for the freer exercise of those gifts? At

first it seemed impossible. His own diocesan, beyond the sea, was not unkindly disposed, but hampered by technical difficulties almost impossible to surmount. But, just when it seemed as if the way was hopelessly shut-up, it was generously opened by the hand of the wise and large-hearted Bishop of Niobrara. He expressed his willingness to accept this clergyman of a foreign Church, and to give him work as a Presbyterian in his frontier jurisdiction. It would not be easy to tell here of the joy and gratitude with which that offer was accepted. The newly-appointed Presbyterian set out for his new field, and in a little while his friends heard from him that he was at work in it with a heart full of courage and hopefulness.

They little dreamed how soon and how tragically the new-found task was to drop from the hands that had grappled with it, nor how soon those hands were to be folded in their last repose. Less than eighteen months since it was begun had past, when the telegraph brought to a thousand homes and more in the East, where the missionary work of the Bishop of Niobrara was a subject of almost daily thought and prayer, the tidings that "the Rev. R. Archer B. Ffennell, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a missionary among the Indians, had been shot by an Indian while on his way from the government agency at Cheyenne." And the despatch continued—even amid the eagerness of unnumbered other interests the press of the country found time for that—"it is believed that Mr. Ffennell was shot by mistake as he was extremely popular among the Indians."

This was all that they who had watched him and his work with equal sympathy and anxiety, could learn for days and weeks. And then they learned the rest. Already the story has been briefly and more or less imperfectly told in the columns of the secular and Church press, but it is only recently that a clear and accurate history of Mr. Ffennell's work and of the circumstances of his death have been in the possession even of his most intimate friends. The following letter relates that history with a simplicity and pathos which will need no other words to deepen their effect, and he who has told this story thus far gladly leaves it to a worthier hand to finish it:

SANTEE AGENCY, NEB.,  
Nov. 22, 1876.

REVEREND AND DEAR DOCTOR: I can hardly tell with what thankfulness I have just read in *The Church Journal* your words about our dear brother, the Rev. Mr. Ffennell.<sup>1</sup> I have longed to hear from some one that knew him, that I too might bear my testimony to his noble life.

He came here but little more than a year ago, a perfect stranger to all of us. He passed up the river to his mission without stopping at Santee, but stayed for a time at Yankton Agency, to become somewhat acquainted with his future work. I first heard of him through the clergy and Sisters stationed there, as a man of most excellent spirit and as one singularly perfect and earnest in his preaching.

Last autumn, returning overland from a Government Commission to the Western Dakotas, I first met him personally at Cheyenne Agency on the Missouri. At that time his gentleness and humility, and most of all, his sweet, pure, earnest face, made an impression on me never to be forgotten.

Mrs. Hinman was also at the same time spending some days with her sister at the Agency, and meeting him nearly every day and attending his evening services at the garrison, became not only well acquainted with, but warmly attached to him, as one in every way fitted for and devoted to his high and holy calling, and most of all, one who though capable of filling an exalted position in the Church, understandingly and sincerely condescended to men of low estate, men more miserable than the most abject of the poor—to blind and cruel barbarians. The intimacy that grew up between them at that time lasted until the death of Mrs. Hinman, and it was from his letters to her that I learned most of the sweet spirit of the man.

He worked earnestly, not only for the Dakotas, who were his especial charge, but also for the soldiers at the garrisons, both at the Agency and at Fort Sully, ten miles away. I remember a circumstance connected with his work among the military people, that, though seeming strange at the time, your words have made plain. An officer of rank was being tried by Court Marshal for drunkenness, and Mr. Ffennell was summoned as a witness. His testimony was so kind and charitable toward the ac-

---

<sup>1</sup> The reference here is to the very imperfect report of an address delivered at a service memorial of the Rev. Mr. Ffennell, held in Grace Chapel, New York, on Sunday evening, November 12, 1876.

cused that many of the officers were offended at him and stopped attending his religious services. He bore it all calmly and quietly, not losing heart or omitting any duty, though at times only two or three met with him. Now we understand his charity. It was a Christ-like pitifulness—that held up to us by the Apostle in Heb. ii., 18.

Last spring I made another hurried visit to Cheyenne Agency and again met Mr. Ffennell. He invited me to accompany him to his Mission and stay a Sunday there, and talk to his boys and preach to his Dakota congregation. I knew he had no housekeeper, but as he insisted, I went with him gladly. I can never forget what I saw there. It shames me when I think of the devotion of the man. He was living alone (his house-keeper having been taken sick and being only a burden to him) with his school of twelve bright Indian boys, and with no other help than that of a Santee catechist, a man of fully his own age, and who had been sent up to assist him in his religious services among the Dakotas, he himself being yet unacquainted with the language.

There these two, one the Rev. Mr. Ffennell, a gentlemen of good family, liberal education and culture, accustomed to all the comforts and kindnesses of civilized life; the other, John Kitto, a man but now redeemed from heathenism, not understanding the English language, his only gift the grace of God, which had made him in gentleness and humility singularly like his white brother in character. These two were living together and without other help caring for and teaching their little family of Dakota boys, who were seemingly as dear to both of them as if they were their own children.

In the morning while John and some of the larger boys cared for the younger ones and attended to righting the Dormitory, Mr. Ffennell with others, prepared the table and did the cooking. After the meal and prayers, John and his party cleared the table, while Mr. Ffennell and his, attended to the stable and garden, and then all met in school until time to prepare for dinner; and so on through the entire day, and every day, both were entirely engaged in mission work. No office too mean for either, and no man, red or white, so poor, or wretched, or wicked, as not to receive their kind and prompt attention. On Sunday Mr. Ffennell not only read the service (very well for the short time he had heard the language) but also sat at the organ and led the chants and hymns. I found the public part of the house well kept and in perfect order, the table as nicely set as for a festival among whites, and the boys tidy, clean and well-behaved. A remarkably pleasant and cheerful set of fellows, when



you thought that they had but just been taken from a camp of wild and barbarous Indians.

In our brother's own room the evidences of his unselfishness appeared. He was poor indeed. He could find time to care for others but not to care for self. Everything that he did not absolutely need to make his appearance passable was given away, and he had no time to attend to, or hardly know, his own wants, and no time except late at night for correspondence or for reading. He denied himself proper food, proper clothing and needful rest, that he might have to bestow upon his work. The well-dressed, quiet clergyman that I met the Fall before, had now become the rough and hardy looking pioneer.

I said to him, "My dear brother, you can't stand this, you have not been accustomed to it, you will wear out and get sick. You had best stop and rest until the Indian Commission send you out some helper. The Church does not expect nor wish that you should live in this way. You are attempting too much and you certainly ought to take better care of yourself." I had told him before of my pleasure at seeing his boys, and their improvement, and of my deep interest in his large and attentive congregation in chapel. He said, "No, if you think I have accomplished anything, I am more than satisfied. It is very little one can do for the Master, especially in such a work as this, where everything is strange and the people heathen, and the language difficult. I have felt that I did not know how to work and could not understand the Indians, but I begin to know them better now. I really love my boys and some of the men. I most sincerely pity the condition of their people and feel outraged at the way they are neglected and despised by the American people. If I have done or can do anything whatever for them, I am more than paid for all my work and all my trouble." After a few words more between us, and an expression on his part of great grief at Mrs. Hinman's death, and of his sense of the good and quiet influence she had exerted while staying there, we parted. His English farewell, "God bless you, my brother," were the last words he ever spoke to me.

In September last, coming back with Bishop Whipple from the Treaty Council at Red Cloud and Spotted Tail Agencies, at Missouri Valley Junction we met Bishop Clarkson. His first words were "Have you heard the sad news? Mr. Fennell has been killed by an Indian, while returning from the Agency to his Mission." We had seen trouble and had reasons for apprehending trouble at the Agencies just visited, and these words fell upon our spirits like a pall. The Bishop loves the Indians as a man only can love a people for whom he has labored and suf-

fered. I never saw him more grieved at heart. He feared that our whole work for these people would be hindered and injured, especially where the disturbed state of the Indian country was not known and understood.

We thought and said, "It is sad indeed that he should die such a death, die alone and far away from home; above all, die by the hands of a people he would willingly have given his life to save. Yet it was so our Saviour died, and if he has vouchsafed us a martyr so soon, in our little mission among the Dakotas, we may well take heart; these troublous times will soon be overpast and the work so doubly dear will surely live." It did not seem strange to us that a Christian soldier should bravely fall at his post of duty, for that might any time have happened here, and as we know, has often happened in the history of all missions throughout the world; but it seemed strange that he, the last to come, and so unselfish in his spirit, should be the first to fall. And then we remembered the words of our Lord—"The first shall be last, and the last shall be first," and could not know but that he best deserved to enter into rest. We did not then know of his noble victory over self, and I am sure now his memory is doubly dear to us all.

I was somewhat delayed in my return to Santee. Leaving Yankton after morning service on Sunday, I had hoped to be at home for evening prayer in our own chapel. I did not arrive at the river bank opposite until after dark and had difficulty in finding the ferryman to take me across. As we approached the Santee shore we could see a man walking up and down on the bar of sand that reaches from the bank to the water. It was John Kitto. He did not certainly know that I was coming then, but had thought I might arrive that night, and was anxiously waiting for me. After greeting, his first words were, "We have heard that my friend is killed; is it true?" Then after being told, "My mother is here dying and he sent me down for a few days, that I might see her once more. Now I have a letter from him asking me to come back, and he is dead. I must go. I do not want the work to stop. The white missionaries will not be allowed to keep it up. I feel sad that God has ordered that I should be separated from him in his death. I would gladly have died for him. I am a Dakota and am of very little use in this life. I can do but very little. He was noble and wise and kind, and lived only to do good to the poor wicked people who have killed him. You did not know him. I lived with him day and night, and seeing him always, I learned as I never knew before what it means to live a Christian life. He was humble and unselfish and kind, and made himself tired and sick and poor to help those blind, foolish Indians. He cared for their

little boys as if they were his own. He was indeed nearer than a brother to me. Do let me go up with you, and if thought best, I am willing, till this trouble is over, to live in the Mission-house and work alone. I can't do much, but perhaps I can keep the people who come to prayers from falling away. I think you can get one of your Santee catechists to join me and help me, if the Bishop will allow it. I would like George Paypay; I have talked with him and believe him earnest and sincere, and willing to work anywhere he may be sent."<sup>1</sup>

On reaching the Mission House at Santee, I found a letter from Mr. Ffennell, from which I take the following extracts:

"Some time since I had a letter from our Secretary respecting lessening expenses, etc., and I replied that I might perhaps now be able to get on without a catechist, stating at the same time that I should miss John Kitto very much, and that I hoped if he was taken from this, he would be provided for elsewhere."<sup>2</sup> Since then I have heard nothing."

"I am glad to hear that you are coming with the new commission, and shall be glad to see you when you pass through here. I miss Major and Mrs. Bingham (the late agent) very much. They are a real loss to us all. Dr. Cravens, however, appears likely to make a good agent; and is very friendly to the mission. I expect we shall have not only rumors of war, but war itself, in our midst. Some troops have already arrived here; and more are on the way. When these come, I believe operations are to commence, but the military do not speak much of their intentions. If a rash step is taken, I believe that many of our friendly Indians would be changed into hostiles. I am glad to hear that Bishop Whipple is one of the Commissioners."

These words show not only his love for his people, but his bravery in working on, though he knew that danger threatened.

We two, Kitto and I, started that night for Cheyenne Agency. On

<sup>1</sup> It is proper to note here that I granted his request, and that the Bishop since visiting Cheyenne Agency, has approved Kitto's plan, and that George Paypay the Santee catechist, mentioned by him above, has gone up with his wife to aid him. The Bishop writes of them, "I trust he and John will do well. The latter has acquitted himself nobly."

<sup>2</sup> I quote this to show how the neglect of Christian people to keep up their interest in Missions, cripples the work and breaks down the workers, just where help and work is most needed and deserved; also to show the simple self-devotion of the man who could thus, without a murmur on his own account, offer to give up his only helper.

arriving there I learned the full particulars of Mr. Ffennell's death. I write them out, because your account, as reported, is wrong.

The attack, made by the troops under Gen. Custer, upon the Sioux of the far West and the overwhelming defeat of his command, had very naturally produced great excitement among the Indians at the Agency. Anger at the injustice of the attack on their friends, while the wrong of the forcible taking of the Black Hills by the whites was yet unsettled, and exultation at the defeat of the army in the first great battle were freely and loudly expressed. The whole Indian people were disturbed and unquiet. The bolder of the men left openly to join their hostile brethren in the war; others were very much troubled and restive; and almost all were in word, at least, disloyal to the Government on account of wrongs and deceits supposed and real, which had been practiced upon them by the whites.

Before the people had become quiet from this disturbance, and while troops, for what purpose was not known, were being sent among them, an Indian, a young man, was reported to the commanding officer recently come to the country, as having been engaged in haranguing the camp in favor of an attack upon the troops at the Agency garrison. He was arrested and put in the guard-house, though he denied the charge. The Rev. Mr. Ffennell, fearing trouble from this arrest, and believing the charge against the Indian to be ill-founded and probably only camp rumor, went and interceded with the officer for his release. The prisoner did not know of this. He had vowed to kill the first white man he met. He was released. He was not a Christian, had never attended Church and had never met Mr. Ffennell face to face.

Mr. Ffennell frequently came from his Mission, three miles away, to the Agency, to hold services, or make purchases, or for his mail. The chief, near whom he lived, offered always to accompany him and did often come with him. On this occasion he came down with only two of his smaller boys. He remained a long time at the Agency. In talking with Mrs. Cravens, the wife of the Agent, he seemed very sad and depressed, and gave as a reason that he thought the outlook very bad and the future very dark. She urged him several times to remain over night, but he said he must go home to his boys. He said, on leaving the door, to Mrs. Cravens, "I feel very badly; I am sure that something terrible is about to happen, not far away, but right here at the Agency." These, and the "Good-night" were his last words.

Riding home in his wagon, as he drove through the dry bed of a creek, two Indians mounted on ponies, rode up from behind, and as he

turned to look at them, he was shot through the head by one of them and through the body by the other. He fell from his wagon and the Indians fled. His horses ran away with the two little boys. In the darkness of the night the Indians were not recognized by the boys. They were supposed to be the man released from the guard-house and his brother, as both were missing from the camp in the morning. The shots were heard at the Indian village near the Mission, and a Christian Indian running down the road found the body and carried the sad tidings on to the Agency.

The Indians in camp were quickly mounted. A party of thirty went in three hours twenty-five miles up the river to the Mission Station of Rev. Mr. Swift, where he was living with his wife and family. They went of their own accord to protect them and bring them down to the Agency for safety. Another and larger party went till morning over the usual westward trail, in pursuit of the murderers. They were not overtaken; it was found in the morning that they had fled over an unused trail leading further southward. The friendly and Christian Indians were simply astounded at the dastardly deed, and to think that Mr. Ffennell of all men should be killed by one of their people. They came in large numbers to the Agent's house to look upon his face for the last time, and they wept like children. The effect upon the whole camp was wonderful. For whereas before they had been seemingly undecided what to do, and sullen and semi-hostile in their demeanor toward the whites (though never so toward Mr. Ffennell), now when they saw this cowardly act, they came out openly for the whites and their protection, leaving all questions of right or wrong between them, for future settlement.

So our brother lived and so he died. On one occasion before, an angry Indian had searched his house to find and kill him, but his time had not yet come. He was away on duty at Fort Sully.

In losing him the Cheyenne Sioux lost one of their most devoted friends, and we of the Mission, a man that in such days as these was invaluable to the work. But we are in the hands of God, and whether by life or death, by weakness as well as by strength, He can and will make His own cause to triumph.

What you have said of our brother's past was not known to us, but we can testify abundantly concerning his "rising again." And after all, is not one who stands redeemed, lifted up from such and so deep an abyss as that, a wonder of the grace of God; a better man and a stronger, than the cold-hearted, selfish one, who has never fallen, (as men count falling) only from want of temptation?



Bishop Patteson, working on amid known dangers, (and dangers, as was the case with Mr. Ffennel, an hundred-fold multiplied by the wicked connivance of the Government with wrong) and working among a like barbarous and simple-minded race, fell at his post of duty by the hands of his own wards, and after reading his life, I think, we rightly call him The Martyr of Melanesia. And may we not so call our dear brother, R. Archer B. Ffennell, a man saved by the Grace of God, gentle, humble, trustful, true, patient and faithful to the end—The Martyr of Niobrara?

Surely we cannot doubt that he now awaits in Paradise the crown of saintship and the martyr's palm, and better still, the priceless garment of those who "have come out of great tribulation and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Those who have read the *Memoirs of John Coleridge Patteson*, the first Bishop of Melanesia, will own that there is more than one point of resemblance in the work and in the end of the Missionary to the Islanders of the Pacific, and of the Missionary to the Indians of Niobrara. Bishop Patteson was unwilling to talk much of his own work, and was ever wont to make light of his own sacrifices. He prized especially his work among the boys of his Mission and drew these closest to himself. And when his end came, he fell by a blow dealt in blind revenge for the wrongs wrought by white men, and dealt by those to serve and save whom was the one thought of his life. As in the case of the American Missionary, too, the wound which ended the life of the English Bishop pierced his brain, and was struck from behind.

But there was another and more precious resemblance. Writing of the Bishop of Melanesia, soon after his tragic death, one of his native deacons, Henry Tagalana, said, in language of which the following is a literal translation,

As he taught, he confirmed his good life among us, as we all know; and also that he perfectly well helped any one who might be unhappy about anything and spoke comfort to him about it; and about his character and conduct they are consistent with the law of God. He gave the evidence of it in his practice, for he did nothing carelessly lest he should make any one stumble and turn from the good way; and again he did nothing to gain anything for himself alone, but he sought what he might keep others with, and then he worked with it, and the reason was his pitifulness and his love. And again, he did not despise any one nor reject any one with scorn, whether it were a white or a black person he thought them all as one, and he loved them all alike.

"He loved them all alike!" "That," says the biographer of the Bishop of Melanesia, "was the secret of John Coleridge Patteson's history and labors." Yes, and of Archer Ffennell's no less! And so, as we close this volume of an heroic and martyred life, we bless God that, whether in the Islands of the Pacific or on the frontiers of the far West, He is giving to His Church new witnesses to the power of His redeeming grace, and other, but not less noble and saintly souls, who have not counted their lives dear unto themselves, so that they might finish their course with joy and the ministry which they, with Apostles and Martyrs gone before, received of the Lord Jesus.

HENRY C. POTTER.

THE STORY OF A HOUSE. *Translated from the French of Viollet-le-Duc by George M. Towle. Illustrated by the Author.* BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY.

THE HABITATIONS OF MAN IN ALL AGES. *By Eugene Viollet-le-Duc. Translated by Benjamin Bucknall, Architect. With numerous Illustrations.* BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY.

These books are sufficiently alike in subject to be noticed together. "The Story of a House" is really a practical treatise on Domestic Architecture, interwoven with a slight story, to give unity, and add a little more interest to the dry details. A boy is at home in the country for the vacation. The time begins to hang heavily on his hands. How shall he occupy himself? There is a recently married sister for whom the father proposes to erect a house. He suggests to the boy that he shall try his hand at drawing the plans. This takes his fancy, and he becomes deeply interested in the building. There is a cousin, an architect, who, coming on a visit, remains and is put in charge of the work. He appoints the boy, Paul, superintendent under himself; discusses with him the requirements of a residence, the general principles of architecture, the qualities of materials, explains the manner of drawing plans; and instructs him how to superintend the work and keep the accounts. In short, we are thus led on from the selection of a site, and the choice of the style and the arrangement of rooms, step by step through all the processes of erecting a substantial stone house up to the final completion. The book is thus made interesting to the general reader, while the author has the opportunity, of which he has taken good advantage, for inculcating the general principles of his art. There are few subjects on which we as a people are more ignorant than on that of architecture. We have had no style of our own, deserving the name, and we have imitated, without any regard to convenience, fitness of location or climate, those of other countries. Examples of this may be seen in the wooden Grecian Temples, and what we have heard called "Dutch-Gothic" compilations which dot the beautiful shores of our rivers and bays. There is, indeed, a better taste now; but still there is great room for improvement. And we are very deficient in just principles to guide us in building. We remember to have examined a costly house, in which there was not a chamber wherein a bed could be placed without shutting up a door or window; convenience had been sacrificed to looks. Those thinking of building would do well to consult this book, for though they would not be likely

to reproduce "the house," they may learn some principles, and get some hints, which will be found very useful.

The other work gives us a description of the "Habitations of Man in all Ages." Of the two this last will be the most generally interesting. Those who wish to know how their ancestors have lived through the Ages, will here find the desired information. The author has traced the influence of race and climate on domestic architecture, and shows whence arose the peculiarities of the different styles of building in different countries. It is needless to add that in both volumes the illustrations, by Viollet-le-Duc, are numerous and beautiful. And the name of the publishers is a sufficient guarantee of the mechanical excellence of the books.

---

THE MORALS OF TRADE. *Two Lectures.* By R. Heber Newton. NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER. 1876. pp. 110.

These lectures were "given in the Anthon Memorial Church," New York, and printed by the congregation "as a slight contribution towards that bettering of our social life, which will prove our real Centennial celebration." The first is "An Inquiry into the Actual Morality of Trade." The second, "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Existing Demoralization, and the Remedies therefor."

In the first, the writer shows plainly and boldly, what indeed no one doubts, the great want of honesty and honor, especially in the Retail Trade of the country. And it is a good sign that the Church is awaking to a sense of her duty that our younger clergy are beginning to apply the ethics of the Bible to the concerns of every-day life. This part of the work is well done. In the second lecture also there are many things well said. We think, however, that few practical men will agree with the writer as to the remedy he suggests for the evils of Trade, viz., the giving the whole matter of regulating production and price over into the hands of "Trade Associations." To our minds the remedy would be far worse than the disease. It is another illustration of the truth, how much easier it is to point out evils, than to suggest remedies. The author, in this lecture, says some very good things about the duties of Manufacturers and Trade Associations and Educators, both Cleric and Lay, which we wish might be widely read and considered. We think, however, there is some confusion in his mind, which we are inclined to believe arises from his theological views, in regard to the mutual relations

of doctrine and ethics. He says, "The Church has emphasized not morality, but spirituality; not conduct, but belief; not life, but dogma," etc. We suggest to the author, whether he may not himself have fallen into the same error which has led to that one-sided teaching of which he complains in the Church, meaning thereby, we suppose, the great body of those who profess and call themselves Christian ministers. There has been, and is now, a tendency to separate doctrine and morals personal religion and duty. This was the mistake of the old Evangelic School in the one direction, and we think it is now the tendency of what is called the Broad Church School in the other. The true Christian teaching is that there cannot be the one without the other. Whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder. True doctrine enforces as a necessary result true morality. And sound morality springs from and derives its sole reliable support from full dogmatic teaching and faith in God's revelation. The sure remedy for dishonesty will be found in the earnest promulgation in its fullness of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. And nowhere is there a better summary of that teaching than in the "Duty to God" and "Duty to Man" of our Church Catechism. Nor can any motive be found of sufficient strength to overcome the selfishness of our nature, which lies at the root of all this evil, except that set forth by our Lord Himself; "If ye love Me, keep My commandments."

---

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. *By John Peter Lange, D. D., etc. Vol. xiii. of the Old Testament: Containing EZEKIEL and DANIEL.* NEW YORK: SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO. pp. 492, 272.

The Commentary on Ezekiel was written by *W. J. Schröder, B. D.*, of Elberfeld, Prussia. Translated and enlarged chiefly by *Dr. Fairbairn*, of Glasgow, Scotland. That on DANIEL is by *Dr. Otto Zöckler*, also of Prussia. Translated and enlarged by *James Strong, S. T. D.*, of the Drew Theological Seminary, New Jersey. *Dr. Fairbairn* is already well known as the author of a commentary on Ezekiel, and his editorship adds greatly to the value of the work. At the late hour in which this volume was received, we cannot pretend to give any opinion as to its intrinsic merits. But *Lange's* commentary is so well known, and valued, that it is sufficient to announce the issue of a new volume. There are no books of the Bible more difficult to understand, or about which there has been more controversy than the two treated in this volume, and students will hail with pleasure this new effort to elucidate them.



CREDENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY. *A Course of Lectures delivered at the request of the Christian Evidence Society. With a Preface by the Earl of Harrowby, K. G.* NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER, No. 2 BIBLE HOUSE. 1876. pp. 283. \$2.00.

These Lectures, six in number, were delivered in London, and are intended to meet the popular infidelity of the day; to enable the Christian who has neither time nor inclination for deep studies, to answer the objections which are now so widely urged against the truth of the Christian religion. The topics discussed are, "The evidences for the Inspiration of Holy Scripture; by the Bishop of Carlisle," "The Evidence of the Truth of Christianity supplied by Prophecy; by W. L. Alexander, D.D., F. R. S. E.," "The Positive in proof of the Historical Truth of the Miracles of the New Testament; by the Rev. C. A. Row, M. A., Prebendary of St. Paul's," "The adaptation of Christianity to the Requirements of Human Society; by Alfred Barry, D.D., D.C.L., Principal of King's College, London." "The Evidence to Christianity arising from its Adaptation to all the deeper wants of the Human Heart; by the Rev. Peter Lorimer, D. D., Professor of Theology in the English Presbyterian College, London," and "The Adequacy of the Christian answer to all deeper Questions; by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol." This list of subjects, with the names of the eminent writers, will suffice to show the character of the book, and also be a voucher of its ability. The publisher has presented it to the American reader in the good type and paper which characterize his publications.

---

THE STORY OF GOETHE'S LIFE. *By George Henry Lewes, (abridged from his "Life and Works of Goethe."* BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY. pp. 406.

The author tells us in the preface that this book is intended for the "many readers who may feel considerable interest in the story of the great poet's life and aims, though they are not greatly attracted by criticisms and details in relation to works written in a foreign language and but partially accessible through translations." We think he has done wisely in giving this abridgement of his larger work. All of any literary pretensions desire to know the story of Goethe's life, and here they have it in a reasonable compass. Mr. Lewes' larger work is so well known that it is unnecessary to say anything in praise of it. This smaller one contains all that the ordinary reader requires.

WIT, HUMOR, AND SHAKSPEARE. *Twelve Essays by John Weiss.* BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1876.

This volume contains a series of charming essays on some of the most interesting of Shakspeare's characters, prefaced with two on Wit and Humor. Mr. Weiss has not attempted to give us any of those fine drawn, profoundly metaphysical disquisitions, which of late have become so much the fashion. He has done very much better than this. It has been his endeavor rather to call attention to, and render apparent those many beauties which, requiring no deep delving to find, are yet, perhaps, less appreciated by the mass of Shakspeare's readers and admirers, than they would readily acknowledge or would easily believe.

A great charm of the book is the absence of all attempts at fine writing, although we would not have it supposed the author is never eloquent. We are satisfied very few can read it without pleasure and much profit. Those seeking in it the deep analytical nonsense of German and English enthusiasts, will be disappointed. But to that large class, (and many in their hearts belong to it who are loudest in outward admiration), who in spite of honest endeavors, are unable to see those beauties, to feel that marvellous power, which have made Shakspeare the wonder and despair of succeeding ages, this book will prove very instructive, and cannot fail to open to them the door to these rich treasures.

We would call attention more particularly to one essay—that on Americanisms—wherein Mr. Weiss shows that our extravagant humor is but a heritage from Elizabethan times, the direct, legitimate descendant from Falstaff and the clowns of Shakspeare. The opening essays on Wit and Humor, we think, are not worthy a place with the others, and fail in their purpose, that of showing the subtle distinctions which divide them. A certain carelessness of style sometimes mars the usually painstaking workmanship of the book.

---

POEMS OF PLACES. *Edited by Henry W. Longfellow.* BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY. 1876.

We have received of this series, complete, ENGLAND in four volumes, IRELAND in one; also one volume of SCOTLAND, the latter to be followed by one or more.

This collection of poetry is, as the name indicates, entirely novel in

plan. It gives us all that has been written in English poetry about the various places, arranged alphabetically—a metrical guide book. We quote:

I have always found the poets my best travelling companions. They see many things that are invisible to common eyes. Like Orlando in the forest of Arden, they "hang odes on hawthorns and elegies on thistles." They invest the landscape with a human feeling. \* \* \* Even scenes unlovely in themselves become clothed in beauty when illumined by the imagination, as faces in themselves not beautiful become so by the expression of thought and feeling. \* \* \* For myself I confess that these poems have an indescribable charm, as showing how the affections of men have gone forth to their favorite haunts, and consecrated them forever.

The collecting and editing this series is evidently a labor of love. The whole circle of English poetry has been ransacked to furnish it forth. It is surprising how much love of locality there is, so to speak, in the hearts of our poets; indeed, it is this which gives such truth to their writings. Many rare gems, not easy of access, are here brought to view. Much of the older poetry is to those of the present day tedious, if not altogether unreadable; yet scattered through it are exquisite bits of description, and we owe a debt of gratitude to him who has undergone the labor of digging into these mines and extracting for us, and placing in proper setting these precious gems.

The first volume opens with a Prologue by James Montgomery, "A voyage round the world," which appears to have suggested the idea of the series. This is followed by introductory poems on travelling in general. Then on places in England, etc.; and the editor promises that these shall "be followed by others of a like character, descriptive of other countries, till the 'Voyage round the world,' sketched by Mr. Montgomery in the poem which stands as prelude, shall be brought to a safe and happy end." We say, God speed the mariner! We have only to add that the volumes are of pocket size and beautifully printed.

---

LECTURES, DELIVERED AT ST. MARGARET'S LOTHBURY. *By Henry Melvill, B. D. New Edition.* RIVINGTONS, LONDON: POTT, YOUNG & Co. NEW YORK. 1876. pp. 371.

Many will remember the interest excited by Melvill's sermons. A selection from them was published by the late Bishop of Ohio, which is now out of print. This new edition of the Lothbury Lectures will therefore be welcome to the sermon-reading public. It is unnecessary for us to do more than call attention to it. The earnestness, evangelic piety, and vivid imagination of the author, give to his sermons a vitality which will secure for them a permanent position in Church literature.

"IN THE DAYS OF THY YOUTH." *Sermons on Practical Subjects, preached at Marlborough College, from 1871 to 1876. By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F. R. S.* NEW YORK: MACMILLAN & Co. 1876. pp. 398.

Very few persons have the faculty of writing for boys, still fewer of writing sermons for them. To do this well one must retain much of the boy-spirit, must remember the aspirations and longings and temptations and difficulties of opening manhood, and sympathize with them. Such only are well fitted to guide and teach the young. There is in every boy good for anything, a manliness, a chivalry, and a religiousness, latent perhaps, which himself may be unconscious of, or ashamed to confess, but there they are; and it is by no means unusual that the boy of highest spirits, perhaps the ring-leader in mischief, has the fullest share of these; needing only the "Ithuriel spear," the touch of love and truth, to bring them into action. Dr. Arnold had this, hence his wonderful influence over boys. From the volume before us we should judge that Dr. Farrar also has the gift, at any rate, in sermonizing. For these are not dull conventional discourses, but direct, plain talks to boys about concerns of their every-day life in school, and of what they ought to be when they leave school. They are full of interest, enforced with examples taken from history, with animated appeals to all that is manly and good in the boy-nature. We wish we had space for quotations, but must content ourselves with referring to the sermons on "The courage of the Saints possible in Boyhood," and on "School Games." We know it is not easy to get boys to read sermons, but we think if a boy could be persuaded to begin these, he would be sure to finish them.

---

IMAGINARY CONVERSATIONS BY WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR. *First Series: Classical Dialogues, Greek and Roman.* pp. 463. *Second Series: Dialogues of Sovereigns and Statesmen.* pp. 424. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1876.

At this day it is scarcely necessary to say much about these writings of Landor, and yet as a new generation is coming forward who may have indeed heard of him, yet have not had the opportunity to read his works, it will not be amiss to tell them of the great treat which awaits them in these beautiful dialogues; and when they have perused them they will unite with us in thanking the publishers for giving us so cheap and elegant an edition of them.

Landor lived many years in classic countries, was an accomplished

scholar, and has thoroughly imbibed the spirit of ancient literature. It is difficult to believe that some of these dialogues may not have been translated from the Greek or Latin. They bring vividly before us the thoughts and manners and scenery of Greece and Rome. There is in them much of the dramatic element, so that even the gestures of the speakers are brought to our imagination by their words. The author warns us to "avoid a mistake in attributing to the writer any opinions in this book but what are spoken under his own name." This is to be borne in mind in reading, because otherwise we might do the writer great injustice, so completely has he in the classical dialogues identified himself with the person represented as speaking.

Of the two series, we think the second, of conversations between moderns much inferior. The author appears to have put more of his own opinions into the mouths of the speakers. We may instance the conversation between Washington and Benjamin Franklin as an example. We do not think he has properly expressed the language or character of either of these men.

---

THROUGH THE YEAR. *Thoughts relating to the Seasons of Nature and the Church.* By Horatio N. Powers, D. D., Rector of St. John's Church, Chicago. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. pp. 288. \$1.50.

This book does not take up each Sunday of the Christian year, as such works generally do; but consists of a series of lectures on the Seasons, as groups; Christmas, Lent, Easter-tide, Whitsuntide, Trinity; to which are appended three essays on Agassiz, Sumner and Kingsley. The author traces very beautifully the analogy of nature and the Church Seasons. He dwells more on the inner religious life than on its outward manifestation. There is little, if any, of what is commonly called "Church teaching;" little recognition of the fact that it is to the Church we owe these seasons; or that the religious life needs "the outward visible sign," as well as "the inward spiritual grace." But apart from this, there is much that is very good in this book; there is a vivid appreciation of the beauties of nature, a deep religious sentiment, an earnest setting forth of the Christian life, and the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer. And the principal doctrines of our Holy Religion are incidentally and perhaps on that very account, more practically taught. If we were disposed to criticise the style, we should be inclined to say that it is rather too diffuse and ornate; it gives us the impression of extempore speaking. The writer is rather fond of epithets, but then he uses them well.



A COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By Rev. W. Denton, M. A. In two volumes. Vol. II. LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. 1876. pp. 404.

This second volume completes Mr. Denton's commentary on the Acts. In a former number we expressed our opinion of the value of the first volume, and the second only confirms this favorable impression. Unlike most commentaries this will be found useful to the general reader, the more learned comments being placed in the foot notes. It is remarkable for its clearness of expression and good common sense. The long notes between some of the chapters add greatly to its value. Thus, after chapter xix., there are three essays, on "Ephesus," on "The Baptism of John," and on "Confirmation." This last giving a full history of that ancient rite. We specially commend this work to the notice of the Laity, as a valuable addition to their libraries.

---

SELECTIONS FROM THE IMITATION OF CHRIST, BY THOMAS A KEMPIS, BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. pp. 97.

SELECTIONS FROM THE THOUGHTS OF MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. pp. 90.

These pocket volumes of the "Wisdom Series" are sufficiently explained by the titles. They contain judicious selections from their respective authors, with an introductory sketch of their lives. Taken together, they serve as good illustrations of Christianity and Heathen Philosophy, the latter giving us very beautiful moral maxims, but nothing that touches the heart; the former giving us in addition the one motive, without which moral precepts remain but a dead letter, viz. : the love of God in Christ. They both may be studied with profit.

---

BIBLE HISTORY. *Old Testament.* By Rev. J. Frederick Esch. NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER. pp. 192. 75 cents.

This book is intended to give a Bible History in language adapted to children. The author has, we think, succeeded in his purpose simply because he has not attempted children's language, whatever that may be, but has adopted the Bible English, than which there is none better suited, in its simplicity, to children, merely leaving out repetitions, and as much as possible using the very words of Scripture. He has in brackets occasionally added a word explanatory of the text. We think the book well suited for its purpose.

THE GATES OF THE EAST. *A Winter in Egypt and Syria.* By Henry C. Potter, D. D. NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & Co. 1877. pp. 259.

As the author tells us in the Preface, "Books about the East of a far less unambitious character than this little volume, are already abundant." The charm of this is precisely that it is "unambitious." The writer tells us simply what he has seen, with no forced enthusiasm or fine writing. And though those familiar, as who is not, with books of travel in the East may not find any thing new in these pages, yet they will find much to interest, and some topics not usually dwelt on. The account of a Coptic Wedding, and of Education in Egypt, are of this character.

---

MILE-STONES IN OUR LIFE-JOURNEY. By Samuel Osgood, D. D., LL. D. *New and Enlarged Edition.* NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & Co. 1877. pp. 368.

This was originally published in 1854. And the fact that after going through several editions this new and enlarged one is called for, is evidence of the value of the book. It was received too late for careful reading; but the dips we have been able to make into it here and there, have brought up much that has interested us, and given us some beautiful thoughts. The "mile-stones" are Childhood, Youth, Manhood, Middle-Age, Old-Age, Death, Immortality. To which in this edition are added "After Thoughts."

---

FRANK LESLIE'S SUNDAY MAGAZINE. Conducted by C. F. Deems, D. D. 1877. Vol. 1, No. 1. \$2.50 per annum.

That person must be very unreasonable indeed, who can expect to get more or more varied matter for the subscription price than is contained in this new magazine. This January number contains, among other matter of general interest, these of special interest to us, "Some Sundays in London," by H. C. Potter, D. D.; and an account of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Paul, Rome, Italy. The illustrations are numerous and good, though some of the plates have evidently done service before.

**THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST.** *Being an Examination of the Doctrine contained in the first three Chapters of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians.* By George Staunton Barrow, M. A., Vicar of Stowmarket. RIVINGTONS, LONDON. POTT, YOUNG & Co., NEW YORK. 1876. pp. 206.

We should judge that these were written as Lectures for Parish use, now arranged in chapters, instead of sermons. It is practical in character, not a commentary or critical. The book is very good, but there appears to us to be in it nothing so new or better expressed than has been written before on the same subject, as to call for its publication.

---

The following were received too late for more than mere mention :

**FIFTY YEARS WITH THE SABBATH SCHOOLS** By Rev. Asa Bullard, A. M. 1876. pp. 336. \$1.75.

**THE RELIGION OF EVOLUTION.** By M. J. Savage. 1876. pp. 253. \$1.50.

**LIGHT ON THE CLOUD; or Hints of Comfort for Hours of Sorrow.** By M. J. Savage. pp. 176. \$1.25.

All the above are from the Publishing House of LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & COMPANY, 381 Washington Street, BOSTON.

---

**THE CHURCH ALMANAC FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1877.** NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co.

**THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL ALMANAC AND DIRECTORY FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1877.** T. WHITTAKER: NEW YORK.

These Almanacs are things of necessity for the study table of every Churchman. It costs a great deal to get them up. We are informed the Publishers make little or nothing by them. It would be a good thing if some wealthy layman in each parish would furnish his Rector with a supply for Christmas gifts.

---

E. P. DUTTON & Co., NEW YORK, have issued a good edition of Mozley's Sermons, at a low price, putting them within the reach of all.

## MISSIONS.

There is a kingdom which though not of this world is yet in it. A kingdom, none the less real because spiritual, with all the attributes of a kingdom. Having a King with all needful subordinate officers, laws duly promulgated and enforced; subjects under oaths of allegiance, with the duties and privileges of citizenship. In short, the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth, with its ministry and sacraments, its written laws, its commission to go and disciple throughout the world.. Such a kingdom did Christ establish, over such He is King, to such He has given a promise of victory—"that it shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." For more than 1800 years this kingdom has been wonderfully preserved. It has resisted all the violence of its foes; it has escaped the wiles of its pretended friends; has stood under the weaknesses of its defenders; it has been attacked in every way, under all manner of pretences, by prosperity, by adversity, and though like a bark, now tempest tossed, then strained in calms, it has been sorely tried, has met with loss, a spar carried away here, a sail torn asunder there; yet in all and through all it has survived, and from all its trials has come forth more than conqueror. The gates of hell have not prevailed against it.

Our Lord in establishing this His kingdom did not mean that it was to stand still, to be a mere name with no vitality. On the contrary it was to be aggressive; it was to spread. We have already alluded to the commission given to its first officers, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." All men have spirits; all therefore owe allegiance to the King of spirits; all should be brought into the spiritual kingdom here on earth, that they may be prepared for admission into the fulness of spiritual life in the land of spirits. Hence, missions, "Go ye," mitto, "I send," missus, "sent," to call men out of darkness to light, from the kingdoms of this world to the kingdom not of this world—to that of heaven, to tell how they may be reconciled with God, through His dear Son, and so be changed from carnal to spiritual, and fitted for an entrance into His eternal kingdom. In brief this is why Christ appointed Apos-

ties, those sent; Missionaries we now call them. This is why the Church, obeying the very law of her being, and the command and example of her Master, continues to send forth." And when she ceases to do this, her very life-blood must stagnate within her, when she fails to mission, to send.

In this Missionary work we recognize, for convenience, two branches: the one to set up the kingdom as an entirely new thing among those who never before have heard of it, *i. e.*, the heathen, which we call Foreign Missions; and the other to spread its influence and establish it more firmly in our own land among those who have heard of it, but have not received it, or who have only in part and imperfectly been taught the nature of Christ's kingdom. To this latter branch, which we call Domestic Missions, we shall confine these remarks.

It may be asked by some, What is the necessity of such missions here in our midst, where the Bible is circulated and after a fashion received, where men profess and call themselves Christians, and where societies professing to be churches of Christ, are already established?

We answer, in the first place, though all this be so, still the ground is not fully occupied; even where there are places of worship, there are probably in no city or village a sufficient number to accommodate all the inhabitants, and men may have the Bible, but if they do not read and understand it it does them little good. It does not act as a talisman or charm. "How can I understand, except some man should guide me," said one who was reading in the Bible. And in every community there are large numbers who have never been brought into the kingdom. Our orders are to preach the Gospel to *every creature*, hence the duty and necessity of missions even in our midst.

But in the second place, a very strong obligation to send missions arises from the fact that much of that which is set up among us as Christianity is imperfect in nature, and especially defective in what it teaches of the kingdom, and the responsibility and privileges resulting from admission therein. To specify all the points in which it is deficient would take too much space. We shall refer only to the one already suggested. Christ emphatically declared that His "kingdom is not of this world;" but most of the bodies claiming to be His churches are practically teaching that they are of this world. Here we, as representing the Ancient Church of the Apostles, must take issue with them, and are bound to hold up to view, and urge men to enter the kingdom "not of this world." We claim that the Church is a divine institution; that it is not of man, but by the will of God; that Christ is head over all things to His Church;



and therefore from Him all authority must be derived ; that the kingdom is not an institution to be changed and altered to suit the whims and shifting opinions of men, but is permanent, and in all essential particulars the same yesterday, to-day and to-morrow. Novelty is no element of her constitution. The truths on which she is founded are the same for every age, every clime ; and she is commissioned to proclaim these with steadfast purpose, with no uncertain sound, but with authority, as the keeper and witness of the truth. But is it not too much the case that other bodies, even though in many respects teaching the truth or important parts of the truth, yet do it in an uncertain manner, as though conscious of a want of authority, as though feeling their kingdom is of this world ? And the consequence is that among the people at large there is a growing doubt, a hesitation as to what they are to believe ; and like Pilate, too many are asking the question, " What is truth ? " Not from a sincere desire to know, but from a feeling that there is no positive truth ; what each chooses to believe, that is for him truth. We think no one who carefully has watched the course of what is called the religious world can deny that there is a great deal of this uncertainty about, and that as a consequence infidelity under various forms is increasing. Hence the importance of Domestic Missions. That thus the Church of Christ in its fulness as emanating from Him, with its authentic commission, its positive doctrinal teachings, its clear exposition of duties, its prominent sacraments, and virtually *unchanging* yet accommodating forms, should be held up to view, widely diffused among our people, as the pillar and ground of the truth. That it should be set forth clearly as the kingdom, not of this world, which can teach and exhort with all authority what things men are to believe and do in this world if they would please the Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer of all.

Men are becoming tired of religious systems, which are fickle and carried about with every wind of doctrine, and are too often used by crafty men to further their own worldly schemes and devices. They feel that " the world passeth away and the fashion thereof," and they are looking for " the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Is this a time to hide this kingdom, to withdraw it from the sight of men ? In plain words : Is this a time to neglect missions ? Domestic Missions, Home Missions ! If there be any truth in what has been written, it would seem on the contrary, that there never has been a time in the history of our country, when it has been of more importance to hold up in clear and prominent view, the " kingdom not of this world," to teach in plain language, the Church of Christ, in its ministry, doctrines.

sacraments and precepts, as a sure refuge and quiet resting-place from the cares and contentions of this world, as pointing to a higher, a nobler life to come. And never surely has there been a time when men were more ready to receive its authoritative teachings and to enter within its calm abodes. Is this a time when we are to cease from missionary efforts? When we are to fold our hands and, because of difficulties, to give up even what we have undertaken? Instead then of relaxing in our missionary efforts, as we have lately done, of stinting the treasury of God because of the times, it is our clear duty to redeem the time and make more strenuous, more sustained efforts to hold up before men "The kingdom not of this world." When souls around in every place are crying out for certainty, for a sure foundation—let not the Church of Christ be derelict in her great mission of proclaiming, "This is the way, walk ye in it."

In doing this work we must not forget that our kingdom is not of this world; and there is, therefore, one principle which must underlie all our efforts—that is, FAITH. Faith in the help of Him for Whom and through Whom we contend. "It is God that giveth the increase," and therefore we are not to rest in worldly wisdom, but we are to use means the world would sneer at as utterly incompetent, and we may hope for success in circumstances where the arm of flesh would despair. Therefore it is that with all the imperfections of the system, missions do meet with success, they do good—not as much as they might, but still they do great good. Souls are saved, men are drawn into the kingdom, Churches are established. Hence we are to go on; in spite of imperfections, in spite of apparent failures, we are still to go on—to go on in faith, to do what we can. This is what we need to sustain us; for if we had more faith we should have more zeal, and if more zeal, then more success. And if we would have more faith we must have more love, love for our God and Saviour, to promote His glory, love to our fellow men to save their souls. Prompting all missionary effort should be love and faith. Let, then, all who have care for missions, earnestly ask of Him the giver of every good and perfect gift to give to His Church an increase of Faith and to shed abroad in the hearts of His people the love of His Son, through the Holy Spirit—that thus "strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man," all may devote themselves more earnestly to His service, "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

Since writing the above, we have received, with request to print, the following *statement* and *letters*. In lieu of what we were going to say, we append these. Trusting that what has been written above, may be deemed not altogether inappropriate as introductory.

## A STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Domestic Committee of the Board of Missions, at a Meeting held November 22, 1876, ordered the following statement of facts to be laid before the Church, through the Church papers and Missionary publications, and in all other practicable ways.

(1.) The indebtedness of the Committee, September 30th—the close of the fiscal year—was \$23,000.

(2.) On the 1st of October, the Committee were obliged to provide \$20,000 more, with which to pay the quarterly stipends of nine Missionary Bishops, and more than two hundred other Missionaries.

(3.) On the 1st of January, over \$20,000 more will be needed to pay stipends and other bills for the quarter ending with that date.

(4.) The receipts, from October 1st to November 20th, have been much below those for the corresponding period of last year.

(5.) *The Committee have therefore been forced to postpone all Appropriations for 1877, until the mind and will of the Church can be known.*

The Committee are glad to bear their full share of the responsibility of conducting this great Mission work, but they cannot bear it all.

*Earnestly as they sympathize with, and heartily as they endorse, the urgent special appeals of our Missionary and other Bishops, they must remind the Church that no money sent to aid them in establishing schools or building churches, will enable the Committee to pay the stipends due to them, or to the Missionaries under their charge, for which payments the Church, through the Committee, stands pledged.*

To save the work, or to prevent most embarrassing retrenchment in it, prompt and liberal contributions are absolutely required, and are most earnestly solicited.

(Signed.) Horatio Potter, *Chairman*; Morgan Dix, George Leeds, Henry C. Potter, Noah Hunt Schenck, A. T. Twing, *Secretary and General Agent*; Cyrus Curtiss, Geo. N. Titus, Benj. B. Sherman, Elbridge T. Gerry, Lloyd W. Wells, *Treasurer*.

## AN OPEN LETTER TO THE REV. DR. TWING.

*Contained in "The Churchman" of November 18, 1876.*

MY DEAR DOCTOR: In the good Providence of God, the Centennial year of our Country is upon us. Our Church has numbered a good many Centennials, but it may do her good to celebrate this one of the Union. As one way to celebrate it, I beg to ask your approval and endorsement

of this suggestion, viz, That every *communicant* of our Church be asked and urged to lay by *each week until All Saints' day of next year, ten cents for the General Mission work of the Church.*

We had at the close of last year 261,003 communicants reported. Ten cents per week, or five dollars and twenty cents per year, from these, would yield \$1,357,215.

I know it would be a comfort to your heart, and cheer you in your good work, if such a sum were assured to your Missionary treasury. If you approve the suggestion, will you not endorse it in your earnest way, and with your earnest words?

I am, very truly, yours,

WILLIAM J. CLARK.

GERMANTOWN, PHILADELPHIA,

*All Saints' Day, 1876.*

---

#### DR. TWING'S REPLY.

MY DEAR BROTHER: I thank you very heartily for your "Open Letter" to me contained in THE CHURCHMAN of the 18th instant. I have read it over and over, and reflected upon it with deep and increasing interest. Its suggestions are most seasonable, and are worthy of the careful and conscientious consideration, not only of every communicant of this Church, but also of all who, though not communicants, have aided, and are willing to aid, our Mission work.

Your suggestions are general, and as applicable to other Departments as to that in behalf of which it is my special duty to speak; but in substantially adopting them, I must confine myself to my own appointed sphere, endorsing them solely with reference to the Domestic Missionary work of the Church.

I think it may fairly be assumed that the persons calling themselves Churchmen, who are interested in and aid our work—including children—but are not communicants, are equal in number to those who are. The Church Almanac for 1876 estimates the number of communicants at 280,000, or nearly 20,000 more than you mention in you letter as belonging to us at the close of last year; giving a total, of communicants who ought to be, and of non-communicants who may be interested in our work, of 560,000.

An average of ten cents a week from each of these would give us, in one year, the enormous sum of \$2,912,000!

An average of half this, or five cents a week, from each of these, would give us still the magnificent sum of \$1,456,000!

But supposing each gave only an average of two cents a week, we should even then have \$582,400, or as much as has been given by the whole Church for the General work of Domestic Missions in the last five years!

And if we should look for still less, and each of these 560,000 persons should contribute an average of only one cent a week, the amount received would be \$291,200, or enough to pay all our debts and enable us to double our work for the coming year.

It is of course easy to show on paper how great results might be attained without an overburdening of a single soul; but it is far enough from easy to turn such estimates into realities. In this sort of calculation there is a seeming of castle-building in the air, but a due consideration of the whole subject, and a little systematic and persistent effort on the part of all, would make the castles substance instead of shadows.

The time has come when the Domestic Committee stand greatly in need of just such systematic and persistent effort. In striving to avoid retrenchment in their work, through the past three years of financial trouble, they have become laden with a debt, amounting, at the close of the fiscal year, September 30th, 1876, to \$23,000. On the 1st of October they were obliged to provide \$20,000 more, to pay the quarterly stipends of our Missionary Bishops and other Missionaries then falling due; and their obligations must be still further increased on the 1st of next January—unless the Church come speedily to their assistance—by borrowing over \$20,000 more, to meet the payments of the quarter ending at that date.

The Domestic Committee, along with other similar organizations, and following a sort of supposed traditional necessity, have quite too long depended for their needed supplies upon a comparatively few wealthy congregations, and upon a comparatively small number of wealthy persons in those congregations. This is, however, if the Mission work of the Church is to go steadily and vigorously forward, an imperative demand for a new departure, and for such a broadening of their constituency as to embrace and have a recognized place for all who are willing to do *anything* in this interest. In part, the ground for this demand—quite aside from the underlying principle of Christian giving—is to be found in the fact that, within the past three years of financial disorder, many rich and generous givers have become unable to continue their accustomed liberality.

I have spoken of a new departure, and yet it is true that I have long been working with the children of the Church in accordance with the



methods now under consideration ; and with excellent results. The Mite Chests, sent out all over the country, and used mainly by the children, have brought to our treasury, within the past seven years, about \$115,000, which clearly shows the value of such methods, if conscientiously adopted and faithfully carried out by all. I do not give up the dear children, but I earnestly wish that their elders would consider well the suggestions made in your letter and enlarged upon here.

An exigency has arisen when such consideration is to the last degree important, as the Committee, taking into account their heavy indebtedness and the present unpromising outlook, have felt themselves under the necessity of notifying the Bishops, now receiving aid through them, that the accustomed Appropriations to their several Dioceses and Missionary Jurisdictions for the ensuing year must be delayed till the mind and will of the Church on this whole subject can be ascertained.

The Domestic Committee are charged by the Church with the duty of providing the salaries and traveling expenses of nine Missionary Bishops, and stipends for over two hundred Missionaries beside.

Their receipts, that can be used for this purpose, from the 1st of October to the date of this letter, are, in a marked degree, less than those for the corresponding year.

The Committee have no other resources with which to provide for their Appropriations, than the contributions of the Church. Of its 2,800 parishes, so far as the Committee have knowledge, 1,675 contributed last year nothing at all to the Domestic Missionary work.

The Committee need the substantial co-operation of every one of these 2,800 parishes. They need the personal contributions, however small, of every communicant and of every person interested in Mission work. Above all they need an awakened sense, in the mind of the whole Church, of the extreme gravity of the emergency.

Shall the work of the Committee go on? Shall their obligations be met and honored? Or shall our Missionaries be dismissed, and their work abandoned?

Thanking you again for the suggestions of your letter, I am,

Very faithfully yours,

A. T. TWING,

*Secretary and General Agent of the Domestic Committee.*

22 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK,  
November 24, 1876.